DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 927 UD 025 664

TITLE	Current Federal Policies and Programs for Youth.
INSTITUTION	Reingold (J.R.) and Associates, Inc., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	William T. Grant Foundation, Washington, DC. Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship.
PUB DATE	Jun 87
NOTE	49p.
AVAILABLE FROM	William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Youth and America's Future, 1001 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20036 (1 copy free).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Cooperation; Agency Role; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Government; *Federal Programs; Federal State Relationship; Higher Education; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Department of Defense; Department of Education; Department of Health and Human Services; Department of Justice; Department of Labor

ABSTRACT

This briefing paper reviews current Federal policies and programs for youth. It discusses the background and funding of initiatives in five major agencies: the Department of Labor; the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS); the Department of Education; the Department of Justice; and the Department of Defense. A brief introductory section presents highlights of the findings, and the following general issues are identified: (1) There is a lack of real coordination within agencies regarding programs that relate to youth. (2) The total amount of interagency coordination and cooperation, in terms of resources, is extremely small. (3) The little interagency activity that does take place is not institutionalized within the various departments. (4) The Federal agencies have devoted few, or in some cases, no resources to facilitate interagency coordination at the State level. (5) It remains to be seen whether the Youth:2000 initiative of the Department of Labor and HHS will receive continued long-term attention and priority. (6) There are insufficient mechanism or incentives to foster investment in multi-year, long-term, institutional change demonstrations. (7) It is very difficult to plan and maintain effective programs, retain good staff, and take on any long-term activities when Federal funding is proposed for elimination year after year. (8) There is no coordinated, comprehensive, long-term, national action agenda consolidating and devoting Federal resources toward youth. The appendixes provide Federal allocations for certain services (e.g., Job Training Partnership Act and Head Start) arranged by state, as well as 1986-87 Chapter 1 allocations. (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

UD

7-6-87

ED284927

Current Federal Policies and Programs for Youth

June 1987

by
J.R. Reingold and Associates, Inc.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Samuel Halperin
William T. Grant Foundation
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD025664

Youth and America's Future:

The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship

YOUTH AND AMERICA'S FUTURE:
THE WILLIAM T. GRANT FOUNDATION COMMISSION ON WORK, FAMILY AND CITIZENSHIP

When William Thomas Grant established the Grant Foundation in 1936, he sought a better understanding of the ways in which individuals adapt to the vicissitudes of life. Touched in his professional life by the importance of good human relationships, Mr. Grant wished to "help children develop what is in them" so they would better "enjoy all the good things the world has to offer them."

Fifty years later, recognizing the special needs of older adolescents in our changing society, the Foundation's Trustees established **Youth and America's Future** with much the same purpose; its charge is to evaluate current knowledge, stimulate new ideas, increase communication among researchers, practitioners and policymakers, and, thus, to help our nation chart a better future for youth.

The Foundation's President, Robert J. Haggerty, M.D., has described the Commission's unique perspective:

"Against a rising chorus of legitimate concern about the many problems facing today's youth, the Foundation has initiated this Commission on Youth and America's Future to speak in a different voice. It will explore the strengths of America's young men and women, their families and the programs and community institutions that serve them. We adopt this approach not to diminish the importance of the problems that exist, but to learn the lessons of success. The Foundation is confident that this effort to look with renewed respect at youth, where it strides as well as where it stumbles, will help forge the links of understanding and mutual responsibility that make our democracy strong."

The publications in this series have been prepared to inform the Commission and to stimulate its thinking. While the Commission does not necessarily endorse the various findings presented, it does encourage their thoughtful consideration in the interests of American youth.

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Harold Howe II, Chairperson
Senior Lecturer, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Byllye Y. Avery
Executive Director, National Black Women's Health Project, Atlanta, GA

Mary Jo Bane
Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Lewis H. Butler
President, California Tomorrow, San Francisco, CA

Fletcher L. Byrom
Retired Chairman and CEO, Koppers Company, Carefree, AZ

Hillary Rodham Clinton
The Governor's Mansion; Partner, The Rose Law Firm, Little Rock, AR

Barbara J. Easterling
Executive Vice President, Communications Workers of America, Washington, D.C.

Josué M. González
President of the Board, Latino Institute; Director, Bureau of Resource Development, Chicago Public Schools, Chicago, IL

Albert H. Hastorf
Professor of Psychology, Stanford University, Standford, CA

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C.
President, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN

David W. Hornbeck
Maryland State Superintendent of Schools, Baltimore, MD

Douglas X. Patiño
President, Marin Community Foundation, Larkspur, CA

Michael V. Reagen
Director, Missouri Department of Social Services, Jefferson City, MO

Henry W. Riecken
Professor (Emeritus) of Behavioral Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

Kenneth S. Rolland
Executive Vice President, Chemical Bank, New York, NY

Bernard C. Watson
President and CEO, William Penn Foundation, Philadelphia, PA

William Julius Wilson
Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL

Daniel Yankelovich
Chairman, Daniel Yankelovich Group, New York, NY

Robert J. Haggerty, MD (ex-officio)
President, William T. Grant Foundation, New York, NY

COMMISSION STAFF

Samuel Halperin
Study Director

Atelia Melaville
Research Associate

Arlette Taylor
Executive Assistant

Foreword

Youth and America's Future, The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship is focusing its studies mainly on youth in the 16-24 age group. As it does so, it also seeks information about research and service programs which enhance the development of young people in their earlier years.

The Commission is sponsoring a number of papers about youth issues. Some of these we call "Information Papers," as represented by this document. These use authors skilled in gathering data to bring together information about youth that is not conveniently available elsewhere. The authors of Information Papers are free to interpret what they present. Their work is distributed by the Commission solely to enrich public discussion about significant youth issues. (As is the case with all of our Commission's publications, there are no copyright or other restrictions on secondary usage. Indeed, readers are *encouraged* to duplicate and otherwise share Commission materials.)

This paper was prepared for the Commission by Janet R. Reingold and Associates to provide a sense of the extent and nature of federal initiatives on behalf of young people. Both the Commission and the authors recognize that it cannot be "complete." But, in the absence of any other organized overview, it provides a valuable snapshot of a rapidly changing scene and describes what our national government is currently doing for young people.

A main contribution of this effort is its display of the number and diversity of federal initiatives affecting children and youth. While it does not include youth benefits from Social Security and other programs (e.g. nutrition, Aid for Families with Dependent Children, Medicaid, etc.) it does offer considerable perspective on a mixture of large and small, relatively uncoordinated programs at both national and state levels. (Indeed, one gets the impression that the main characteristic of federal efforts on behalf of youth may be *disorder and lack of coherent policy*.)

Those who are seeking a more comprehensive understanding of youth in our society will find their insights enlarged by this paper. With that purpose, we are making it available with special thanks to Janet Reingold and her colleagues, who have brought this information together in an exceedingly short time.

Harold Howe II
Chairperson

Current Federal Policies and Programs for Youth

Contents

Foreword by Harold Howe II i

Contents iii

Preface v

Observations and Issues for Consideration vi

Introduction 1

Highlights of Federal Youth Programs and Policies 3
- U.S. Department of Labor 3
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 3
- U.S. Department of Education 4
- U.S. Department of Justice 4
- U.S. Department of Defense 4

U.S. Department of Labor

Background 5

Job Training Partnership Act 5
- Title II Training and Employment Services 5
- Title IIB Summer Youth Program 6
- Title IV Federally-Administered Program (Job Corps) 7
- JTPA Evaluations 7

Other Department of Labor Initiatives Relating to Youth 8
- Literacy-Related Initiatives 8
- Cooperative Ventures with the Department of HHS 8
- Cooperative Venture with the Departments of Labor, Justice, Health and Human Services and Education 10
- Youth Strategy Refinement and Coordination 10
- Special Projects 10

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Background 12

Social Services Block Grant 12

Head Start 12
- Overview 12
- Handicapped Children 13
- Program Impact 13

Runaway and Homeless Youth Program 13
- Overview 13

Child Abuse State Grants and Discretionary Activities 14
- State Grants 14
- Discretionary Program 14
- Funding 14

Foster Care Program 14
- Background 14
- Funding 15

Adoption Assistance 15
- Background 15
- Funding 15

Child Welfare Services 15
- Background 15
- Funding 15

Child Welfare Training 16
- Background 16
- Funding 16

Child Welfare Research and Demonstration 16
- Background 16
- Funding 16

Adoption Opportunities Program 17
- Background 17
- Funding 17

Aid to Families With Dependent Children 17
- Background 17
- Funding 17

U.S. Department of Education

Background 18

Elementary and Secondary Education 18
- Chapter 1 Programs 18
- Chapter 2 Programs 18
- Secretary of Education's Discretionary Fund 18
- Drug-Free Schools and Communities 19
- Teacher Training and Improvement 19
- Indian Education 19
- Impact Aid 19
- Magnet Schools Assistance 19

Elementary and Secondary Education Programs Scheduled For Elimination 20
Special Education and Rehabilitative Services 20
Education for the Handicapped 20
Education for the Handicapped Preschool Grants 20
Education for the Handicapped Grants for Infants and Families 20
Education for the Handicapped Special Purpose Funds 20
Vocational Rehabilitation Services State Grants 20
Vocational Rehabilitation Services Special Purpose Funds 20
National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research 20
Special Institutions for the Handicapped 20
Postsecondary Education 22
Pell Grants 22
Income-Contingent/Perkins (Direct) Loans 22
Guaranteed Student Loans 22
Work-Study and Supplemental Grants 22
State Student Incentive Grants 23
Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students 23
Title III: Support for Developing Institutions 23
Minority Institutions Science Improvement 23
Howard University 23
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education 23
Programs Proposed for Elimination 23
Bilingual Education 24
Vocational Education 24

U.S. Department of Justice

Background 25
Funding Levels 25
Functions 25
The Special Emphasis Division 25
The State Relations and Assistance Division 25
The Training Dissemination and Technical Assistance Division 25
The Research and Program Development Division 25
Programs 26
The Concentration of Federal Effort Program 26
The Missing and Exploited Children's Program 26
Technical Assistance 27

U.S. Department of Defense

Background 28
Military Families 28
Policy 28
Family Advocacy Program 28
Department of Defense Family Advocacy Committee 29
Military Family Resource Center 29
Interagency Activities 29
Agreement with the Department of Health and Human Services 29
Memorandum of Understanding with the U.S. Department of Agriculture 30
Personal Excellence Initiative 30
Literacy and Basic Skills 30

Appendix 31

Preface

The purpose of this briefing paper is to review, department-by-department, current federal policies and programs for youth. **This listing does not attempt to evaluate program effectiveness or assess whether available funds are adequate to meet the needs of the youth population.** This review includes a survey of current federal programs and initiatives in five major agencies:

- U.S. Department of Labor
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
- U.S. Department of Education
- U.S. Department of Justice
- U.S. Department of Defense

A few words are in order about the nature of the information available, and the process of collecting that information:

The program information provided by the agencies varied substantially, agency by agency, in terms of quality, quantity, and format. We have attempted to synthesize the information in a consistent format for ease of review, providing a brief description of each program and available budget information.

An inherent difficulty in such an overview is that it can only be a "static" review of activities, while actually there are constant shifts in priorities, constant changes in grants and contracts as new ones are begun, and as current activities expire and are either extended or eliminated, expanded or diminished.

In none of the agencies was there one single place where all of the youth programs were listed. In most agencies, the staff in one division or office was unlikely to know much about the programs and activities of the other divisions or offices. It appeared that coordination within an agency is as difficult (and often non-existent) as it is among the agencies.

In our research on youth programs in the Department of Defense, we were not able to find funding information on youth programs disaggregated from the total program funding. Therefore, it was difficult to determine relative and absolute dollars allocated to youth in this agency. In this case, we concentrated on describing those specific youth-related activities that Defense administers, with specific information on expenditures where available.

In addition, some agencies were more helpful than others in providing information, referring to knowledgeable people, and responding in general to the questions posed. Along the way, we encountered the full spectrum of assistance, from the most helpful and professional, to the stereotypical bureaucratic brush-off. While this is far from a complete list, we would especially like to acknowledge and thank Ms. Gerrard Fiala, at the Department of Labor; Marlys Gustafson, John Busa, Hussein Ferris, Mike Ambrose, and Katie Miller at Health and Human Services; Margaret Levine, Sharon Wagner, and Ann Voight at the Justice Department; Charlotte Bellamy and Marie Robinson at the Education Department; and Alice McGill and retired Navy Admiral James D. Watkins from the Defense Department. These people went out of their way to help us.

I would like also to thank Cecilia Hilderbrand for performing much of the initial research and information gathering, and Michael Landini for synthesizing and writing the agency descriptions. Responsibility for the content (and any errors or omissions herein) rests solely with myself.

Janet R. Reingold

Ms. Reingold has a thirteen-year background managing federal employment and training programs at the U.S. Department of Labor. Among her positions, she has served as Special Assistant to the Director, Office of Youth Programs; Project Manager for the Vice-President's Task Force on Youth Employment; Editor of the ***Employment and Training Report of the President;*** *and Acting Deputy Administrator, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Development.*

Currently Ms. Reingold is President of J.R. Reingold and Associates, Inc., a consulting firm specializing in training and employment policy, management and executive development, and public relations.

Observations and Issues for Consideration

After identifying and describing federal initiatives for youth within five cabinet agencies, the author would offer these personal observations as a point of departure for further discussion:

1. **There is a lack of real coordination within agencies regarding programs that relate to youth.** In researching programs in each agency, it was difficult to find people who were informed and knowledgeable about the various youth programs within their own agency. Even the public information office was often not knowledgeable about the agency's own youth programs. In no case was there one single place to which to direct inquiries about youth programs, nor was there one document which summarized the total agency effort directed toward youth.

2. Although there is some interagency activity, particularly among the Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services, and occasionally among Justice, Education, Labor, and HHS, **the total amount of interagency coordination and cooperation, in terms of resources, is extremely small.** For example, DOL and HHS have $8 million allocated toward joint initiatives (combined with a match of $8 million in private funding), out of billions of federal program dollars.

3. **What little interagency activity does take place is not institutionalized within the various departments.** The Interagency Youth Task Force has not yet assembled a compilation of federal youth programs, has no clearly defined "role," has no current agenda, and is staffed largely by political appointees, rather than career civil servants. Thus, there is no historical background, institutional memory, or continuity over the long term. Many of the individuals assigned to represent their agencies on the Task Force have little knowledge of their own agency's programs and policies, and have competing priorities and assignments, thus further diluting their effectiveness as a point of coordination.

4. **The federal agencies have devoted few, or in some cases, no resources to facilitate interagency coordination at the state level,** to encourage bureaucracies to work together in serving their clients, and to track their clients over time, and through the range of services. The majority of program funds are channeled to the state level by the individual agencies through block grants, each governed by separate legislative and regulatory requirements, which often impede coordination.

5. **It remains to be seen whether the Youth:2000 initiative undertaken by the Departments of Labor and HHS will receive continued long-term attention and priority.** Although the "Youth:2000" initiative was conceived as a long-term, strategic effort to change the future for the nation's at-risk youth by the turn of the century, the energy and sustained commitment to working on these problems appears to be shorter lived. It appears that internal management shifts, staff changes, and the press of other important issues (such as the proposals for Welfare Reform and the AFDC Summer Youth Program) may diffuse the focus and lessen the priority on the youth issue.

6. **There are insufficient mechanisms or incentives to foster investment in multi-year, long-term, institutional change demonstrations.** Although there are a few such important initiatives, such as the joint DOL/HHS Services Integration Pilot Projects in five states, the joint HHS/private sector funded business-education partnership demonstrations, patterned after the Boston Compact, or the DOJ/DOL/DOE/HHS funded "Cities in Schools" program, these are relatively small when compared to overall program resources. (Presidential appointees are anxious to undertake activities that will show results during their tenure, rather than sowing seeds for another Administration to reap.)

7. **It is very difficult to plan and maintain effective programs, retain good staff, and take on any long-term activities when federal funding is proposed for elimination year after year.** Some programs (such as the Job Corps and the Work Incentive Program), and entire agencies (such as the Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention) are proposed for elimination each year in the President's budget. Even in programs with relatively stable funding history, the federal budget process does not facilitate multi-year activities, because the Office of Management and Budget does not like to add to the already long list of "uncontrollable" items in the budget. For example, until the enactment of the Job Training Partnership Act, no federal job training programs were forward-funded.

8. As all of the above observations indicate, **there is no coordinated, comprehensive, long-term, national action agenda consolidating and devoting federal resources toward youth.** Although individual agencies are administering a variety of programs that serve youth, no one federal agency or joint task force has produced a comprehensive compilation of policies, programs, and expenditures for youth.

Current Federal Policies and Programs for Youth

Introduction

Current Federal Policies and Programs for Youth was commissioned by the W. T. Grant Foundation Commission on Youth and America's Future to survey current federal programs and initiatives that serve young people, and to examine their funding history, including their proposed funding levels as recommended in the President's 1988 budget request, sent to Congress on January 5, 1987.

It is too early to know what will emerge in the Fiscal Year 1988 budget as Congress begins the process that funds all federal activities. Traditionally, the President's budget is the first step in a complex legislative process, and serves as the starting point for negotiations. The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings (GRH) deficit reduction law requires Congress to complete its budget resolution, or overall spending plan by April 15, 1987. Once the budget resolution is enacted, it guides the development of separate legislation which appropriates the actual funds for individual programs and federal activities. GRH requires the House of Representatives to finish its appropriations bills by June 30. The Senate is expected to pass its appropriations bills and to work out final differences with the House by August 15, 1987. Whether such an accelerated time schedule can be met remains to be seen.

This paper does not review all federal youth programs, but concentrates on five major Departments. While several other agencies also have programs that serve youth, most notably the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Housing and Urban Development, the five agencies selected for review encompass most of the social programs and services that traditionally serve our youth population.

The paper begins with a section offering some **Observations and Issues for Consideration.** This section reflects on the federal youth activities within agencies, across agencies, and government-wide, and assesses where we are from the author's point of view. It does not suggest specific recommendations for the Commission to endorse, but rather provides some food for thought and some reflections on the Administration's current youth initiatives.

The second section provides **Highlights of Federal Youth Policies and Programs** within each agency. It provides an overview of special interagency initiatives or other priority projects undertaken by Secretary of Labor William E. Brock, and Secretary of Health and Human Services Otis R. Bowen, representing their special policy leadership and interest in youth programs.

The third section of this paper provides a **Department-by-Department review of the major programs and activities serving youth,** including the legislatively-mandated programs, and various discretionary activities that are underway. To our knowledge, **it is the first *comprehensive* synthesis of federal programs and activities for youth since the Carter Administration's Vice President's Task Force on Youth Employment, which operated from 1978 to 1980.**

The **Appendix** contains state allocation tables for several of the programs discussed in the paper.

Highlights of Federal Youth Programs and Policies

U.S. Department of Labor

The Administration is requesting enough funds for job training programs to keep funding for most of the programs at current, or stable levels. One new legislative proposal sent to Congress during the last week in February is a Summer Youth Program for welfare families (Aid to Families for Dependent Children (AFDC) eligible youth). The Administration seeks an amendment to Title II of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) replacing the existing Summer Youth Employment Program with an AFDC youth program offering year-round or summer components to be operated at local option. The proposed amendment would change the allocation formula for the summer program, and therefore it will be subjected to close scrutiny on Capitol Hill.

Overall, the Department of Labor spends approximately $636 million of its JTPA Title II-A funds on youth, about $800 million under Title II-B for the summer youth employment program, about $612 million on the Job Corps, approximately $8 million over three years in cooperation with Health and Human Services to develop projects that address problems of at-risk youth in school, dropouts, and teenage parents, and another $6.9 million on various discretionary projects and activities which serve youth, for total youth spending of approximately $2.06 billion.

Secretary Brock spearheaded the Administration's **Youth:2000** initiative, which began in March 1986. Secretary Brock funded and co-hosted, along with Secretary Bowen, a national leadership conference in June of 1986, **Youth:2000,** to focus the nation's attention on the complex, challenging, and long-term issues that must be addressed to ensure that our nation's youth have the education, training, and support services needed to prepare them for the workplace and jobs of the future.

The Secretary and his Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Roger D. Semerad, have devoted a portion of their agency's resources towards issues that require long-term commitment, such as remediation and literacy, and they have, in fact, stepped into what would have traditionally been Department of Education "turf," emphasizing "workplace literacy." However, their basic thrust is consistent with the new federalism of JTPA and of this Administration—states and localities determine their own priorities and programs, with little federal regulation, interference, or guidance.

As we enter the second quarter of 1987, it appears that **Youth:2000** remains a steady, low-key effort, and many other important issues, such as expanded programs for displaced workers, welfare reform, and the national concern for industrial "competitiveness," have overshadowed the youth issue at this moment in history.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

It is difficult to aggregate HHS's total spending on youth, particularly those ages 16 to 24, as the budget figures are not displayed in such a fashion. However, it is possible to highlight the Department's emphasis on youth, particularly through its **Youth:2000** initiative, and to describe some activities that have been undertaken.

HHS Secretary Otis R. Bowen, has become a leading national proponent of the **Youth:2000** initiative. After several months of internal work, the Secretary issued an agency-wide **Youth:2000** Management Plan, under which he appointed Jean Elder, Acting Assistance Secretary for the Office of Human Development Services, with overall management responsibility for **Youth:2000** and the accompanying National Youth and Family Goals and Objectives. He also established an HHS Executive Committee comprised of the Assistant Secretaries of Health, Human Development Services, Public Affairs, and Planning and Evaluation, the Administrator of the Family Support Administration, and the Deputy Under Secretary, to provide policy oversight, review progress and provide advice to Dr. Elder and himself on the management of this effort.

Secretary Bowen has stated that goals for the year 2000 are to:

—Reduce teenage pregnancy by 50 percent;
—Decrease mortality rates for 15 to 19 year-olds by 20 percent;
—Increase high school graduation rates by 90 percent;
—Decrease substance abuse by 50 percent; and
—Decrease violent crimes committed by young people by 50 percent.

The **Youth:2000** initiative inside HHS is primarily a coordinative effort, which itself requires about $450,000 in resources for management and coordination. It has an ambitious agenda, coordinating with other federal agencies and with HHS's other youth-related projects, such as the Secretary's Initiative on Teenage Pregnancy Prevention, and the "Just Say No" Drug Abuse Campaign.

As of the end of February 1987, the initiative has undergone several changes. The initiative is now headed by a new individual—John Busa—who reports directly to Jean

Elder. An original **"Count Me In for Youth 2000"** public relations and media campaign was developed but not yet implemented.

Secretary Bowen has demonstrated his personal commitment to the effort and has used his public appearances before interest groups and the White House to further the message and the goals of **Youth:2000.** However, little "net new" activitity has resulted to date, as continual staff changes have caused much internal churning.

U.S. Department of Education

The Administration's Fiscal 1988 budget request of $14 billion represents a $5.5 billion reduction from 1987. The programs proposed for funding reductions include the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act programs (from $200 million to $100 million), Teacher Training and Improvement (proposed reduction of $11.2 million), Impact Aid program (proposed reduction of $169.5 million), education for the handicapped preschool grants (proposed reduction of $94.5 million), a $30.6 million reduction in education for the handicapped special purpose funds, a $100 million reduction in vocational rehabilitation services state grants, reductions of $1.1 billion for Pell Grants, $1.8 billion reduction for guaranteed student loans, a reduction of $94 million for special programs for disadvantaged students, a $95.5 million reduction in federal support for developing institutions, and a $4.7 million reduction in funding for the fund for the improvement of Postsecondary Education.

The Education Department proposes elimination of several programs, including a variety of elementary and secondary education programs totalling $93.6 million, education for the handicapped grants for infants and families ($50 million), work-study and supplemental grants ($412 million), State Student Incentive Grants ($76 million), vocational education ($882 million), and a variety of other programs ($112.4 million).

The Administration's Fiscal 1988 budget request emphasized the importance of the early years of learning. Thus, the Administration requested an increase of $200 million for Chapter 1 grants which provide financial assistance to local school districts for compensatory education services for disadvantaged students and to state educational agencies for special education services for children of migratory workers, handicapped children in state-operated programs, and neglected or delinquent children under state care.

U.S. Department of Justice

The Justice Department's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) administers the agency's youth programs. The Administration's 1988 proposed budget contains no funds for OJJDP programs. This has been the case each year since the last year of the Carter Administration. However, historically, Congress restores funding, and it is anticipated that they will do the same this year, although the level of restoration is uncertain at this time. With proposed elimination year after year, the OJJDP has difficulty funding any long-term initiatives, or even developing their internal program plans. At this time, the Department is watching to see what Congress decides.

U.S. Department of Defense

The latest youth initiative undertaken by the Department of Defense stems from a concern that the lack of basic skills training for today's young people has a direct impact on the quality of future recruits for all branches of military service. In response to this concern, Admiral James D. Watkins, (retired) former Chief of Naval Operations, announced a **"Commitment to Personal Excellence"** initiative focusing on basic education, fitness, and ethical conduct. Although it is too early to determine whether the Department of Defense will actually fund programs that address these concerns, the Department is currently spending about $25 million each year for a new computer-driven basic skills program designed to teach military personnel the academic skills necessary to perform specific jobs. Several organizations and educational institutions have recently expressed interest in the use of this computer-driven program to teach basic skills to young people.

Finally, the Department of Defense allocates approximately $15 million each year to assist military families, especially in the areas of preventing child abuse and neglect.

U.S. Department of Labor

BACKGROUND

Department of Labor programs that fund job training services to youth are administered by the Employment and Training Administration (ETA). ETA has undertaken a number of special measures to address the problem of youth unemployment in the following areas:

—Job Training Partnership Act youth components and enrichments to those components;
—Various literacy-related initiatives;
—Demonstration and Pilot Projects for disadvantaged and at-risk youth; and
—Youth strategy refinement and coordination.

JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

The largest program within the Department of Labor that provides training and employment services to young people is the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). The Act was signed into law in October of 1982, and became fully operational in October 1983. Although the Job Training Partnership Act consists of five titles, Title IIA, Title IIB, and the Job Corps Component of Title IV provide services to groups including youth.

The Job Training Partnership Act is funded on a Program Year basis, rather than a Fiscal Year. The Program Year begins July 1 and ends June 30. For the current Program Year—Program Year 1986 (July 1, 1986–June 30, 1987)—$3.3 billion has been appropriated for all JTPA programs. For Program Year 1987 (July 1, 1987–June 30, 1988), $3.6 billion has already been appropriated.

Funding requested in the Administration's budget would be available for programs beginning July 1, 1988. The total amount requested for the Act beginning July 1, 1988 is $3.4 billion.

Finally, because Program Year 1986 has not yet ended, data on program participants presented in the following sections are for Program Year 1985 (July 1, 1985–June 30, 1986).

Title II Training and Employment Services

This Title provides for a system of block grants to states to support local training and employment programs. Funding for this Title is based on a formula that takes into account the relative number of unemployed and disadvantaged persons in the state. States are responsible for further allocating funds to Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) in their states and for overseeing the planning and operation of local programs. Services are targeted to the economically disadvantaged, although 10 percent of those served can be nondisadvantaged individuals who face other employment barriers. Under Title IIA, 40 percent of the funds allocated must be spent on youth. Most youth served are between the ages of 16-21, although 14 and 15 year-olds may participate in pre-employment skills training if it is offered locally.

Basically, five categories of services are provided under Title IIA for both adults and youth. These are:

Classroom Training: basic education, occupational skills training, or a combination of the two. It is usually conducted in a school-like setting and provides the academic and/or technical competence required for a particular type of job. Of the 282,400 persons enrolled in classroom training in Program Year 1985, 41 percent were youth under 22 years old.

On-the-Job-Training: skill training in a specific occupation in an actual work setting. The necessary skills are learned by actually performing a particular job. These positions are usually established with the intention that the participant will subsequently become a regular employee of the employer providing the on-the-job training. Employers are reimbursed for up to one-half of the trainee wages for a period of up to six months. Of the 168,000 persons receiving on-the-job training in Program Year 1985, 30 percent were youth under 22 years old.

Job Search Assistance: any aid provided in locating, applying for, or obtaining a job. The assistance may take the form of job clubs; clinics or workshops in job search skills; labor market orientation; job development; job referrals; or relocation assistance. Of the 164,400 persons receiving job search assistance in Program Year 1985, 35 percent were youth under 22 years old.

Work Experience: part-time or short-term subsidized employment designed to assist participants in entering/reentering the labor force or in enhancing their employability. Included among those receiving work experience may be adults who have been out of the labor force for an extended period and youth who are attending school. Of the 56,500 persons receiving work experience services in Program Year 1985, 73 percent were youth under 22 years old.

Other Services: services not classified in any of the above categories. This includes persons who received services only (including transition services, pre-employment skills, transportation, or employment/training ser-

vices), vocational and/or personal counseling, assessment services, or were placed in a holding status while training or other assistance is arranged. Of the 81,600 persons receiving other services in Program Year 1985, 61 percent were youth under 22 years old.

The following table shows Title IIA youth terminee characteristics for Program Year 1985:

Total Youth Participants	462,848
Total Youth Terminations	348,070
14–15 Years Old	19,337
16–21 Years Old	328,733
School Dropouts	90,027
Student (High School or Less)	129,213
High School Graduate	128,467
White	161,775
Black	128,543
Hispanic	43,593
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,238
Average Weeks Participated	19
Average Hourly Wage (for those entering employment)	$4.14
Youth Entering Employment	173,269
Youth Entering Apprenticeship Programs	130
Youth Entering Armed Forces	1,573

For Program Year 1985 (July 1, 1985–June 30, 1986), a total of 1,066,555 persons received training under Title IIA and total program costs under this title were about $1.53 billion. Of this amount, $636 million was spent on youth 21 years old and younger. During the period, a total of 462,848 young people participated in Title IIA programs, and 348,070 completed the program during the period.

Program Year 1986 JTPA Title IIA allotments to states are provided in the Appendix. The Administration has requested $1.78 billion in Title IIA grants for Program Year 1988, the same amount that is available for the current 1986 program year. A total of $1.84 billion has already been appropriated for the Program Year beginning July 1, 1987. The President has asked Congress to rescind $57 million of that appropriation so that the same funding level is available over all three Program Years.

Title IIB Summer Youth Program

The Summer Youth Employment and Training Program provides economically disadvantaged youth ages 16–21 (although some 14 and 15 year-olds may be included in summer programs if they are included in the job training plan for their local areas) with employment and related training and educational services during the summer months. Funds for the program may be used for basic and remedial education, institutional and on-the-job training preparation for work, outreach and enrollment activities, job search and job club activities, and other employment or job training activity that will prepare young people for work or place them in jobs. Funds may also be used for supportive services necessary to enable youth to participate in the program.

Amendments to the Job Training Partnership Act enacted in October 1986 require service deliverers to assess the reading and math skill levels of program participants and describe in their local plans how they will spend funds for basic and remedial education.

Each service delivery area will be required to establish written goals and objectives for the program, such as improvement in school retention and completion, academic performance and employability skills, as well as demonstrated coordination with other community service organizations.

Very little information is collected on the summer youth programs except for the number of participants and level of expenditures. The following table shows the number of participants and expenditures for the Title IIB summer program from 1984 through 1986 and estimates for 1987 and 1988:

Summer	*Participants*	*Expenditures*
1984	793,100	$714,000,000
1985	800,000	$806,700,000
1986	777,600	$784,000,000
1987	613,000	(est.)$635,000,000
1988	694,000	(est.)$750,000,000

Job Training Partnership Title IIB allotments to states are provided in the Appendix.

Summer youth funds are always appropriated on a different timetable (a year earlier) than other JTPA funds, because the summer program begins prior to the normal July 1 to June 30 Program Year cycle. As a result, funds appropriated for any given Fiscal Year are available during the summer of the subsequent Fiscal Year. For example, funds requested in this Fiscal Year 1988 budget would be available for the Program Year of 1988 and the summer of 1989.

The Administration's budget assumes a minimum of $650 million for the summer youth employment and training program in the summer of 1989. This compares to $635 million currently available for the summer of 1987, and $750 million already appropriated for the summer of 1988. The Administration will request Congress to rescind $100 million of the summer funds appropriated for the 1988 program, bringing that level down to $650 million. An additional $150 million will be requested to supplement year-round services in Program Year 1988, which means that the total summer program request in the budget would

be $800 milllion, if new legislation is enacted to replace the current summer program.

In addition to the above funding amounts, a National Alliance of Business survey in 1985 indicated that many private employers support the summer youth employment programs by adding supplemental funds to the regular allocation in their areas—especially in large urban areas.

Although there is only one study that evaluates the summer program under JTPA, most criticism of the program over time has centered on the quality of the program assignments and the degree of supervision provided to young people who participate.

Current work in progress to enhance JTPA programs for youth centers on Title IIB summer youth programs and youth employment competencies.

—The Department has proposed that JTPA service delivery areas operating summer youth programs include a remedial education component in their summer youth programs. Literacy training would be provided for youth who do not meet locally- established standards. A special Training and Employment Information Notice was recently sent to all state JTPA liaisons to encourage operators of summer programs to include a literacy training component in this summer's programs.

—The Department also anticipates specifying new performance standards and reporting requirements for Program Year 1988 for youth competency attainment in basic academic and employability skills for summer participants.

—The Department has published an information guide on developing assessment systems and programs to address youth's skills entitled "A Systems Approach to Youth Competencies." It is now being disseminated to states and JTPA service delivery areas. Training sessions in developing competency-based youth programs will be offered this spring.

Title IV Federally-Administered Program (Job Corps)

Originally authorized in 1964 by the Economic Opportunity Act, the Job Corps is currently authorized under Title IV of the Job Training Partnership Act. The Job Corps provides intensive employment and training and education services to disadvantaged youth ages 16–21. For most participants, these services are provided in a residential setting, although a small percentage of nonresidential programs are authorized. Services include remedial education, skills training and work experience. Job Corps is a total service program that provides subsistence, clothing, health care and recreation to participants.

Currently, there are 107 Job Corps centers located throughout the country. Of these, 77 are operated by contractors to the Department of Labor and the remaining centers are operated by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior as Conservation Centers.

Between 1977 and 1981, the size of the Job Corps doubled. For the past several years, funding for the Job Corps averaged approximately $600 million per year which supports about 40,500 service years (slots). With participants moving into and out of the Job Corps system, this amounts to service to about 100,000 individuals per year. For Program Year 1985 (July 1, 1985 - June 30, 1986), costs were approximately $6,000 per year per participant.

The Program Year 1986 Job Corps appropriation was $612 million, and the Program Year 1987 enacted appropriation was $656 million. The Administration has requested $651 million for the Job Corps for Program Year 1988—$4 million less than appropriated for Program Year 1987. The Labor Department has proposed to close poor-performing, high-cost centers beginning in January 1988.

There have been several recent Job Corps projects and initiatives undertaken or planned by the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration. These new initiatives include:

—Ongoing Job Corps projects are now using computers and audio- visual equipment to teach young people basic educational skills with the goal of helping them pass the GED or attain literacy levels at the ninth grade or above. Also, recent revisions to the Job Corps GED program incorporate a new edition of the GED test (to include a writing sample) and curriculum changes to enable preparation for the new version of the test.

—The Job Corps is currently evaluating the results of three pilot projects with the assistance of Executive Resource Associates.The Pilot Projects are:

  —The Residential Counselor project designed to test a revised concept for operating the residential component at four centers;

  —The introduction of young adults ages 22 to 24 into the program at 10 centers to determine the value and feasibility of their Job Corps participation; and

  —The Magnetic Patterns of the English Language project to determine whether video teaching can be used as an alternative communication skills program to the existing reading program.

JTPA Evaluations

Evaluations of the effectiveness of the Job Training Partnership Act conducted thus far have differed significantly in their results.

—Some critics of JTPA have stated that because the program's performance standards emphasize placement in unsubsidized jobs, JTPA primarily serves

individuals who are most job-ready, rather than providing services to those most in need.

—A report issued by the General Accounting Office in March of 1986 notes a lack of specificity of definitions, inconsistency of data items maintained by JTPA Service Delivery Areas, and insufficient information to measure adequately the amount of training provided to program participants.

—Three studies regarding business involvement with the program present conflicting information about the extent of private sector involvement—from rather extensive active participation to very little long-term participation.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF LABOR INITIATIVES RELATING TO YOUTH

Literacy-Related Initiatives

The Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration has recently moved to address the problem of youth illiteracy by providing information exchange and guidance, joint project development with other agencies, and public awareness initiatives. Some of these efforts include:

—Working with Karl Haigler, Director of Adult Literacy in the Department of Education, to identify education programs that provide literacy and basic skills development for Job Training Partnership Act clientele. The information gathered will be disseminated to the JTPA delivery system. Mr. Haigler is also currently identifying potential interagency demonstration projects with literacy components.

—Participating in the Project Literacy U.S. (PLUS) project (which was organized by ABC/PBS) to present a series of documentaries on the problem of literacy followed up by the organization of community task forces in all ABC/PBS markets. JTPA program operators and administrators were encouraged to participate actively in these local task forces.

—Conducting, at five sites, the Summer Training and Education Program (STEP), through Public/Private Ventures. This program divides the summer youth program into 90 hours of work, and 20 hours of life planning sessions. Youth (ages 14–15 at the beginning of training) are enrolled for two consecutive summers.

—Operating JOBSTART, a model skills training program consisting of 10–15 exemplary youth projects furnishing occupational skills training enriched with remedial education and other services to disadvantaged dropouts aged 17–21. The program, operated by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC), is jointly funded by the Ford, Mott, and Rockefeller Foundations and by the National Commission for Employment Policy. The Department of Labor provides about 25 percent of MDRC's costs related to evaluation, project oversight and dissemination. An evaluation by MDRC will feature a research design with experimental and control group individuals assigned at random from the pool of program eligibles.

—Providing Targeted Jobs Tax Credit (TJTC) incentives for employers to hire individuals certified by the employment service as members of "targeted" groups such as economically disadvantaged youth and welfare recipients. It provides a credit of 40 percent of the first $6,000 in wages. It also includes a special 85 percent credit for wages paid for summer employment of 16 and 17 year-old disadvantaged youth. No funds are requested to cover administrative costs incurred by the employment service for certification of eligible workers under the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit program. In legislation already enacted for Fiscal Year 1987, the Congress has authorized employment service offices to use existing operating funds for these costs.

Cooperative Ventures with the Department of Health and Human Services

The Assistant Secretary for the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration and the Assistant Secretary for the Department of Health and Human Services' Office of Human Development Services have signed an agreement to develop cooperatively projects to address problems of at-risk youth in school, dropouts, and teenage parents. Considerable effort is directed at remedial education work by the public school system in conjunction with the private sector. The projects include the Services Integration Pilot Projects (SIPP) and the Coordinated Discretionary Fund Program projects. These projects are described below.

Services Integration Pilot Projects

The Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration has transferred $500,000 to the Department of Health and Human Services to support the Services Integration Pilot Projects in five states. The projects are designed to promote effective and efficient integrated human services delivery. Funding for the projects has not yet been announced. Among the five, three explicitly identify youth as a target group:

—Pregnant teens and teenage parents will receive individualized, integrated services to enhance their independence through the Maine Department of Human Services. Education, training and employment ser-

vices are included in a range of services leading to employment and reduced repeat pregnancies. *[Maine Department of Human Services, 200 Main Street, Lewiston, Maine, 04240]*

—The Oklahoma Department of Human Services project in five rural counties is aimed at reducing long-range dependency on public assistance by teenagers who are currently members of Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) families through a streamlined and uniform assessment, referral, and service tracking system. *[State of Oklahoma, Integrated Services Project, Department of Human Services, Field Operations Division, P.O. Box 25352, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 73125]*

—At-risk youth and pregnant teens are targeted for services at multiple sites in the South Carolina Services Integration Project. Using a statewide case management system, comprehensive services are focused on increasing the social and economic self sufficiency of these teenagers. *[South Carolina Reorganization Commission, 228 Solomon Blatt Building, 1105 Rondell Street, P.O. Box 11485, Columbia, South Carolina, 29201]*

Coordinated Discretionary Fund Program

The Coordinated Discretionary Fund Program includes projects which the Department of Labor and Health and Human Services are jointly funding under the Department of Health and Human Services' Coordinated Discretionary Fund Program. A listing of these projects that pertain to youth follows:

Replication of the Boston Compact. Decreases truancy and improves school performance in exchange for jobs through an agreement between private sector employers and the school systems in seven cities. Total Federal seed funding provided to the National Alliance of Business for the project is approximately $170,000 per year, for three years (with the Alliance contributing an additional $100,000). *[National Alliance of Business, 1015 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005]*

Inner-City Centers for At-Risk Youth. Provides remediation and employment opportunities for at-risk youth in residential settings in five inner city neighborhoods. Funding of $159,865 for this project will provide services for 1,000 youth. *[Eisenhower Foundation, 1125 I Street, N.W., Suite 504, Washington, D.C. 20006]*

New York City Boys Athletic League. The police athletic club will sponsor a special counseling remedial education program for at-risk youth. A total of $73,529 will provide these services for 200 young people in New York. *[New York City Boys Athletic League, 1123 Broadway, Room 917, New York, New York, 10010]*

Juvenile Awareness Program. A comprehensive service center to reduce gang violence by increasing education and employment opportunities in New Castle, Delaware. Funding of $162,500 will provide services to 140 youth in the New Castle area. *[Juvenile Awareness Program, Inc., 19 Lambson Lane, New Castle, Delaware, 19720]*

Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin. This project will provide remedial education and employment opportunities through an adult/mentor program. A total of $18,600 will provide services to 3,500 youth. *[Oneida Tribe of Indians, P.O. Box 365, Oneida, Wisconsin, 54155]*

YMCA Project in Manchester, New Hampshire. This project provides an outward-bound type remediation and counseling program for at-risk youth. Funding of $93,461 will provide remediation and counseling for 144 young people. *[YMCA, Manchester, New Hampshire, 30 Mechanic Street, Manchester, New Hampshire, 03101]*

Project Pride. Uses job behavior coaching and part-time employment to encourage economic self-sufficiency among Aid to Families With Dependent Children recipients in Springfield, Illinois. A total of $150,000 will provide services to 150 participants. *[Project Pride, Department of Administration, 316 S. Second Street, Springfield, Illinois, 62762]*

Rural Opportunities Youth Integration Projects. Serves farmworker youth through academic assistance, labor market information, support services and jobs. A total of $100,000 will provide these services to 120 young people in rural New York. *[Rural Opportunities, Inc., N.Y. State Operation, 339 E. Avenue, Suite 305, Rochester, New York, 14604]*

Youth Improvement Programs. Offers GED, work experience and job placement for young offenders in Florida. Funding for this project is $100,000 which will serve approximately 50 young offenders. *[Lake Flagher Private Industry Council, P.O. Box 351, Daytona Beach, Florida, 32015]*

Franchising the Operation Success Model. Intensive program to aid dropouts, particularly homeless youth in shelters and foster care, through employability. Funding of $198,955 will provide aid to 950 young people in New York. *[Human Resources Administration, 250 Church Street, Room 1233, New York, New York, 10013]*

Reaching for Education to End Poverty for Indian Teens. Uses adult monitors, alternative education and employment services to aid Indian teens. Funding for this project is currently undetermined although the goal is to provide assistance to 200 young people of the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe in South Dakota. *[Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, P.O. Box 657, Fort Thompson, South Dakota, 57339]*

National Issues Forums. Joint funding of $177,825 will fund a series of forums across the country to develop community-wide responses to prepare school dropouts and other disadvantaged youth for social and economic

self-sufficiency. These forums will benefit entire communities and will be held in El Paso, Texas; Salem, Oregon; Columbia, South Carolina; Dayton, Ohio; and Bloomington, Indiana. *[Kettering Foundation, 5335 Far Hills Avenue, Dayton, Ohio, 45429]*

Hotel Employment Project for Persons With Developmental Disabilities. A cooperative venture with Holiday Inns in three southern California counties to provide employment in hotels. A total of $151,288 will provide services to 100 participants. *[Disabilities Unlimited, 12448 Pivess Avenue, Downey, California, 90242]*

Private Sector Marketing Strategies to Increase Supported Employment Opportunities for the Severely Developmentally Disabled. Aims to stimulate extensive private sector support and participation in addressing the employment needs of persons with severe developmental disabilities by testing four models. Funding of $186,500 will provide services to approximately 50 individuals. *[Department of Resources and Economic Development, State of New Hampshire, Prescot Park, 105 Loudon Road, Concord, New Hampshire, 03331]*

Montana Employment Project for Persons With Developmental Disabilities. Provides training and technical assistance to local service providers and employers in Montana for enhancing employment assistance. A total of $98,040 will provide assistance to 2,000 participants. *[Montana Planning and Advisory Council, 25 South Ewing Street, Room 506, Helena, Montana 59602]*

Tennessee Initiative in Employment. Seeks to increase interagency collaboration and planning between 10 statewide agencies and organizations in Tennessee. Funding for the initiative is $56,268. *[Department of Retardation, 505 Deoderick Street, Nashville, Tennessee, 37219-5393]*

Teen Parent Center Self-Sufficiency Project. Focuses on the use of alternative education and an employment internship component to prevent teen parents in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, from dropping out of school. Funding of $174,010 will provide services to 750 teen parents. *[Teen Parent Center, P.O. Box 94095, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 70804]*

New Chance: A National Demonstration for Teenage Mothers. A five-city project designed to help teenage mothers who are high school dropouts by working through Private Industry Councils to increase employability skills (with support from the Ford Foundation). Funding of $150,000 will provide assistance to 400 individuals. *[Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, Three Park Avenue, New York, New York, 10016]*

Cooperative Venture with the Departments of Labor, Justice, Health and Human Services and Education

Cities in Schools, Inc., working under an Interagency Agreement with the Departments of Labor, Justice, Health and Human Services, and Education, is providing employability services, including a basic education component, to some 4,500 at-risk or drop-out-prone youth in 15 states. *[Cities in Schools, Inc., 1023 15th Street, N.W., Suite 600, Washington, D.C., 20005]*

The Employment and Training Administration has contributed $800,000 for this project to (1) strengthen current sites, (2) support the creation of training centers to prepare staff to organize new sites throughout the country, and (3) provide for exportation of the program to the new sites. Current and/or potential sites are in California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington and other states to be selected.

A key feature of this project is the use of Job Training Partnership Act Private Industry Councils in 10 of the sites to learn how the training and employment system can work to export the Cities in Schools program nationally.

Youth Strategy Refinement and Coordination

In addition to various programs and interagency projects, other initiatives in the area of youth have been directed at the establishment of continuing working relationships through conferences and task force arrangements. These approaches include:

- —In cooperation with the Departments of Health and Human Services and Education, the Department of Labor sponsored a one-day national leadership conference for youth on June 10, 1986. Hosted by the National Alliance of Business, key topic areas related to youth education, social and employment needs.
- —At the request of Labor Secretary Brock, Assistant Secretary Roger Semerad chairs an Interagency Task Force on Youth. This task force is designed to help strengthen federal collaboration, address priorities in the development of youth-related resources across federal agencies, exchange information and encourage coordination by state and local organizations, and undertake joint federal ventures in the area of youth.
- —Employment and Training Administration and Department of Education representatives have developed an initial implementation plan under the Apprentice-Vocational Education Interagency Agreement that will benefit disadvantaged youth and adults by strengthening the relationship between vocational education and apprenticeship programs at the state level.

Special Projects

In addition to jointly funded projects, the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration funds

several organizations and projects that have a direct impact on youth. These projects include:

70001 Ltd. For the period July 1, 1986 - June 30, 1987, the Employment and Training Administration has provided $1,348,000 to 70001, Ltd. to provide technical assistance to 70001 Ltd. local program affiliates throughout the country. In addition, a portion of the funds will provide employment and training services to about 800 disadvantaged youth between the ages of 12–22. An additional $734,412 has also been provided to 70001 Ltd. for the period July 1, 1986 - December 30, 1987 to develop a model program that can be replicated nationally for serving disconnected youth. Elements contained in the model are designed to be highly motivational and provide intense supportive services and job placement. The program will be conducted in Birmingham, Alabama and Dallas, Texas and provide for the placement of 300 participants in unsubsidized employment. *[70001 Ltd., 600 Maryland Avenue, S.W., West Wing, Suite 300, Washington, D.C., 20024]*

Young Astronauts Career Exploration Project. The Employment and Training Administration has provided $300,000 to the Young Astronaut Council to fund 100 chapters in approximately 20 cities throughout the country. Chapters of up to 30 student members are set up in schools or community organizations in which "Young Astronauts" participate in group learning activities. The project develops educational and career exploration materials to motivate economically disadvantaged youth to pursue educational endeavors related to science, mathematics, and technology. An additional $187,500 was provided to the Young Astronauts Council for a project to encourage youth to complete high school, plan for post-secondary education, focus on high tech career choice and planning, and acquire skills necessary to eventually enter the work force. This project is funded to cover the period January 7, 1987 - January 6, 1988. *[Young Astronaut Council, 1211 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 800, Washington, D.C., 20036]*

Youth Service USA. A total of $250,000 was granted to Youth Service USA, Inc. to provide technical assistance and program design services to metropolitan communities desiring to establish the Youth Service USA, Inc. Job Skills Training and Employment Program. The program is designed to minimize or eliminate barriers to productive employment faced by eligible out-of-school participants ages 18–24 in San Diego, California; Macon, Georgia; Memphis, Tennessee; Norfolk, Virginia; Indianapolis, Indiana; and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. *[Youth Service USA, Inc., 314 S. Goodlett Street, Memphis, Tennessee, 38117]*

Jacksonville 1986 Summer Youth Process Evaluation. A total of $30,000 has been provided to the City of Jacksonville, Florida to conduct an evaluation of the Jacksonville summer youth program. The Jacksonville program was selected as a test of the importance of remedial education as a strategy to prevent dropouts. The funding will cover the period September 25, 1986 - September 25, 1987.

Summer Training and Education Program. $500,000 has been provided to Public/Private Ventures to fund the Summer Training and Education Program which serves approximately 3,000 youth ages 14–15 years old. The program is a multi-site national demonstration project, initiated with the support of the Ford Foundation, which seeks to reduce dropout behavior among disadvantaged and educationally deficient youth. The project draws on the resources of the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program funded under Title IIB of the Job Training Partnership Act, which it combines with focused remedial instruction in reading and math, information about career choices and the consequences of teenage pregnancy. *[Public/Private Ventures, 399 Market Street, 3rd Floor, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19106]*

National Longitudinal Survey of the Labor Market Experiences of Youth. For the period July 1, 1986 - September 30, 1988, the Employment and Training Administration has provided $3,203,000 to Ohio State University to fund the National Longitudinal Survey of the Labor Market Experiences of Youth: Round 9. The survey provides information on a youth cohort (12,686 youth of both sexes age 14–21 as of January 1, 1979). The annual surveys focus primarily on employment, unemployment, job training, and wages. The basic feature of the NLS is that it follows the same individuals over time. *[Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 43210]*

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

BACKGROUND

The Office of Human Development Services (OHDS) is the primary social services program agency in the Department of Health and Human Services. With an overall budget of $5.7 billion, OHDS programs support state social service and related programs that assist a wide variety of people—including youth—to achieve economic and social self-sufficiency.

Programs administered by the Office of Human Development Services that provide services to young people are:

—Social Services Block Grant
—Head Start Program
—Runaway and Homeless Youth Program
—Child Abuse State Grants and Discretionary Programs
—Foster Care Program
—Child Welfare Services
—Child Welfare Training
—Child Welfare Research and Demonstration Projects
—Adoption Opportunities Program

In Fiscal Year 1987, these programs are funded separately. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration's budget request proposes to consolidate most of the above programs (except the Social Services Block Grant and the Foster Care Program) under a generic appropriation of $2.2 billion.

Under the Administration's proposed Fiscal Year 1988 budget, the Social Services Block Grant, Foster Care Program, and Adoption Assistance Program would retain separate funding.

SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

The Office of Human Development Services provides block grant funding designed to give states discretion in determining which social services will be offered and who will receive them. Although recipients of these services represent all age groups, a significant portion of these services is directed toward youth. Child day care and child protective services are examples provided under the block grant.

The goal in providing financial assistance through the Social Services Block Grant is to help individuals achieve or maintain self-sufficiency; to prevent, reduce, or eliminate dependency; to prevent or remedy abuse and neglect of children and adults; to preserve families; and to prevent or reduce institutional care.

For Fiscal Year 1987, funding for the Social Services Block Grant is $2.7 billion—an increase of $116 million from the previous Fiscal Year. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration has requested $2.7 million — the same as Fiscal 1987.

HEAD START PROGRAM

Overview

Project Head Start, originally initiated as an 8-week summer program in 1965, was designed to help break the cycle of poverty by providing preschool children of low-income families with a comprehensive program to meet their emotional, social, health, nutritional, and psychological needs. Since 1965, Head Start has served over 9.6 million children and their families. Recruiting children age 3 to school entry, Head Start currently serves about 450,000 children and their families each year in both urban and rural areas. Programs are located in all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

Head Start services are provided through a nationwide network of over 1,300 grantees serving more than 2,000 communities. The program currently employs approximately 82,000 persons in these communities. About one-third of Head Start employees are former Head Start children or parents of current ones. In addition, over 545,000 nonpaid volunteers work either full- or part-time in the program.

The program is administered by the Administration for Children, Youth and Families. Grants are awarded by Department of HHS Regional Offices.

For Fiscal Year 1987, funding is $1.13 billion, an increase of $91 million over the Fiscal 1986 funding level. Funding for the program during the past six years was:

Year	*Amount*
1982	$912 million
1983	912 million
1984	996 million
1985	1.07 billion
1986	1.04 billion
1987	1.13 billion

For Fiscal 1988, the Administration has proposed consolidating Head Start with other programs under a generic

appropriation of $2.2 billion—although the Administration intends to increase funding for Head Start by $20 million above the Fiscal 1987 level.

Basic Components of the Program

There are four major components in Project Head Start: Education, Health, Parent Involvement, and Social Services.

Education. Children in the program receive a variety of learning experiences. They participate in indoor and outdoor play and are introduced to the concepts of words and numbers. They are encouraged to express their feelings and to develop self-confidence and the ability to get along with others.

Staff members receive training in child development and early childhood education. They learn how to work with handicapped children, who now account for about 12 percent of Head Start's total enrollment.

Health. Head Start emphasizes the importance of early identification of health problems. Since many preschool childen of low-income families have never seen a doctor or dentist, Head Start provides participants with a comprehensive health care program, including medical, dental, mental health and nutritional services.

Parent Involvement. A major component of every Head Start program is the involvement of parents in parent education, program planning and operating activities. Many parents serve as members of Policy Councils and Committees and have a voice in administrative and managerial decisions.

Through participation in classes and workshops on child development and through staff visits to the home, parents learn about the needs of their children and about educational activities that can be carried out at home. Many parents also serve in Head Start on a volunteer or paid basis as aides to teachers, social service personnel and other staff members.

Social Services. The social services component of Head Start represents an organized method of assisting families to assess their needs, and then provides those needed services. Some of the activities that the social services staff use to assist families are: community outreach, referrals, family needs assessments, providing information about available community resources and how to obtain and use them, recruitment and enrollment of children, and emergency assistance and/or crisis intervention.

Handicapped Children

In 1972, the Congress mandated that at least 10 percent of the national enrollment in the program consist of handicapped children. Currently, handicapped children and their families receive a full range of Head Start developmental services. In addition, Head Start staff members work closely with community agencies to provide services to meet the special needs of handicapped children.

Program Impact

Studies indicate that Head Start children score higher than comparable non-Head Start children in preschool achievement tests. Head Start children perform equal to or better than their peers when they enter regular school and there are fewer grade retentions and special class placements.

In addition, the program has had an impact on community efforts for low-income families. One study of 58 communities with full-year Head Start programs indicated that the program had influenced local educational and health institutions to become more responsive to the needs of the poor.

RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH PROGRAM

Overview

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Program, also administered by the Office of Human Development Services, began in 1974 under the Runaway Youth Act. In 1980, the Runaway Youth Act was expanded to include homeless youth, and in 1984, the Act was reauthorized through Fiscal Year 1988.

The program addresses the crisis needs of runaway and homeless youth and their families through support to local and state governments and various private agencies. Grants are used to develop or strengthen community-based facilities which are outside the law enforcement structure and juvenile justice system. The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act mandates that funds for this program be allocated to the state jurisdictions on the basis of the state youth population under 18 years of age in proportion to the national total.

Over the past five years, Federal assistance for the center grants portion of the program have totaled over $75 million and approximately 300,000 young people received services. In addition, one million youth and families have been served through the National Toll-Free Communication System during the past 5 years at an average cost of $330,000 per year. Recent data indicate that 56 percent of the eligible parents received services from the runaway and homeless youth programs last year.

In addition to the funds that directly support temporary shelters for these youth, about 14 percent of the funds appropriated to the program over the last 5 years have been used to fund projects which support and strengthen the shelters. These include the national toll-free runaway

youth hotlines; training and technical assistance activities; and research and demonstration projects on a wide variety of topics including teenage prostitution, chronic runaways, the special situation of older adolescents, and methods to improve program administration, outreach, and prevention and family reunification. Also funded are grants to coordinate activities among local shelters. Funding levels over the past six years for the program were:

Year	*Amount*
1982	$10.5 million
1983	21.5 million
1984	23.3 million
1985	23.3 million
1986	22.2 million
1987	23.3 million

Current funding supports about 285 centers, the national toll-free runaway youth hotline, and various research and demonstration projects.

For Fiscal 1988, the Administration has proposed consolidating the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program under a generic $2.2 billion appropriation. Thus, the specific Fiscal 1988 funding level for the program is not yet known. (See state allocation table in the Appendix).

CHILD ABUSE STATE GRANTS AND DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITIES

State Grants

The Child Abuse and Neglect state grants program assists states to improve and increase activities for the prevention and treatment of child abuse and neglect. These grants are made directly to eligible states according to a formula which includes a base amount plus an additional amount based on each state's population under the age of 18. Over the past five years, this program has assisted states to initiate 24-hour capability to respond to reports of child abuse and neglect; supported pilot projects for responding to child sexual abuse cases; established parent aide and self-help programs; recruited and trained volunteers in the area of child abuse; and developed statewide crisis hotlines and public awareness campaigns.

Discretionary Program

The goal of the Child Abuse discretionary program is to improve and increase national, state, community, and family activities for the prevention, identification, and treatment of child abuse and neglect through research, demonstration, service improvement, information dissemination, and technical assistance to states. The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act provides that the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect shall award grants or contracts to support demonstration or service improvement programs to prevent, identify, and treat child abuse and neglect; compile, analyze, publish and disseminate an annual summary of research on child abuse and neglect; develop and maintain an information clearinghouse; compile and publish training materials; provide technical assistance directly or through information dissemination; and fund programs or projects previously funded by the Department of Health and Human Services which are of national or regional scope and have demonstrated their effectiveness.

Research, demonstration and service improvement grants are awarded competitively to public and private nonprofit agencies, including state and local government agencies, universities, and voluntary organizations.

Funding

Funding levels for the past five Fiscal Years for the Child Abuse State Grants were:

1982	$6.7 million
1983	6.7 million
1984	6.7 million
1985	12.0 million
1986	11.4 million

Funding levels for the past five Fiscal Years for Child Abuse Discretionary Activities were:

1982	$9.5 million
1983	9.5 million
1984	9.5 million
1985	14.0 million
1986	10.0 million

For Fiscal 1987, the Agency has consolidated these programs with the Child Abuse Discretionary Programs and other smaller family-related programs in order to give states greater flexibility in addressing issues of child abuse and family violence. Because many of these activities are discretionary, Fiscal Year 1987 funding levels will not be available until the end of the Fiscal Year. However, funding levels are expected to remain about the same as last year.

For Fiscal 1988, the Administration has proposed consolidating child abuse state grants and discretionary activities under a generic $2.2 billion appropriation.

FOSTER CARE PROGRAM

Background

The Foster Care program, authorized by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, provides funds to states to assist with the costs of foster care maintenance for eligible chil-

dren, administrative costs to manage the program, and training for foster care staff. The purpose of the program is to assist states in providing proper care for children who need placement outside their homes, in a foster family home or an institution.

This program is an open-ended entitlement program, in that the Federal government matches state Medicaid rates for foster care in the states—the amount of the match varies from 50 to 78 percent of the Medicaid rate. Under certain circumstances, if a state spends less than its allotment amount for foster care, it may transfer the remaining funds to provide child welfare services. The average monthly number of children for whom claims have been paid is about 102,000.

Funding

Federal financial participation in total expenditures has varied over the past five Fiscal Years:

1982	$296 million
1983	395 million
1984	478 million
1985	517 million
1986	502 million

For Fiscal Year 1987, funding is $592 million plus a supplemental appropriation of an additional $127 million.

For Fiscal 1988, the Administration has proposed funding for the Foster Care Program of $585 million—a decrease of $134 million from the Fiscal 1987 total.

ADOPTION ASSISTANCE

Background

The Adoption Assistance program, authorized by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, provides funds to states to assist in paying maintenance costs for children with special needs who are adopted under certain conditions. Funds are also used for the administrative costs of managing the program and training staff. The goal of the Adoption Assistance program is to place hard-to-serve children in permanent adoptive homes and thus prevent long stays in foster care.

Like the Foster Care program, the Adoption Assistance program is an open-ended entitlement program. Federal financial participation in state expenditures is provided at the Medicaid match rate which varies among states from 50 to 78 percent. To receive adoption assistance benefits, a child must have been receiving or be eligible to receive AFDC benefits or Supplemental Security Income Benefits.

The number of adopted children subsidized by this program and the level of Federal reimbursement have increased significantly since this program's inception in Fiscal 1981, as more states, especially those with larger populations, have begun operations under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act. From Fiscal Year 1981, when only six states were placing children with subsidies, until Fiscal Year 1986, when all states were participating in Title IV-E, the average monthly number of children for whom payments were made increased from 289 to over 2,100.

Funding

Over the past six Fiscal Years, appropriations for the program have been:

1982	$5.0 million
1983	5.0 million
1984	26.7 million
1985	35.4 million
1986	41.4 million
1987	60.0 million

For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration has requested $97 million for the program—an increase of $37 million—which is expected to provide adoption subsidies to about 39,000 special needs children living with adoptive families.

CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

Background

The Child Welfare Services program, authorized by Section IV-B of the Social Security Act, helps state public welfare agencies to improve their child welfare services with the goal of keeping families together. State services include preventive intervention so that, if possible, children will not have to be removed from their homes, services to develop alternative placements like foster care or adoption if children cannot remain at home, and reunification services so that children can return home.

Funding

Each state receives a base grant of $70,000. Additional funds are distributed in proportion to the state's population of children under age 21 multiplied by the complement of the state's average per capita grant. States that have implemented specific protections for children (contained in the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980), are eligible to share in incentive grants. The protections states must implement to receive the incentive funds include:

1) Conducting an inventory of all children in foster care for at least six months;

2) Establishing an information and locator system for all children in foster care;
3) Conducting periodic case reviews for all foster care children;
4) Providing due process protections for families; and
5) Conducting in-home and permanent placement service programs including preventive and reunification services.

Funding for the program during the past five Fiscal Years was:

1982	$156.3 million
1983	156.3 million
1984	165.0 million
1985	200.0 million
1986	198.1 million

For Fiscal Year 1987, funding for child welfare services is approximately $200.0 million, although final costs for the program will not be available until the end of the Fiscal Year.

For Fiscal 1988, the Administration has proposed consolidating child welfare services under a generic $2.2 billion appropriation request.

CHILD WELFARE TRAINING

Background

Child Welfare Training Discretionary Grants are awarded to public and private non-profit institutions of higher learning to develop and improve education/training programs and resources for child welfare service providers. These grants upgrade the skills and qualifications of child welfare workers through their participation, full-time or part-time in programs focused specifically on child welfare services. Activities supported by the grants include:

—Providing practice-oriented training for workers and supervisors;
—Providing training in critical child welfare issues for key administrators and managers of state public child welfare agencies;
—Improving the ability of state or local child welfare agencies to provide practice-relevant child welfare services training, or to implement staff development activities; and
—Providing financial support to public or voluntary child welfare workers and students to upgrade their practice skills and to acquire specialized information and expertise related to the delivery of child welfare services.

Funding

For the past five Fiscal Years, appropriations for Child Welfare Training have been as follows:

1982	$3.8 million
1983	3.8 million
1984	3.8 million
1985	3.8 million
1986	3.7 million

For Fiscal Year 1987, funding for Child Welfare Training is approximately the same as the previous Fiscal Year. Because available funds for this program can vary, the exact cost of the program will not be known until the end of the Fiscal Year.

For Fiscal 1988, the Administration has proposed consolidating Child Welfare Training funding under a generic $2.2 billion appropriation.

CHILD WELFARE RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION

Background

The Child Welfare Research and Demonstration program is designed to strengthen the family as the primary agent responsible for the developmental needs of children and youth.

Resources allocated to the Child Welfare Research and Demonstration program address the needs/problems of children in foster care, children in need of adoptive homes, children from poor families who require child care, runaways, and homeless youth.

Research and demonstration efforts focus on projects that hold particular promise for contributing to knowledge of how to support the family as the principal child rearing unit and how to enable families to better meet their own needs. Information is generated and disseminated on child rearing skills, family environment, types of resources and services that foster the development and well-being of children, youth and families, and the interactions that occur between families and institutions.

The Child Welfare Research and Demonstration program also seeks qualitative improvements in the services provided for children, youth and families and in the systems that deliver these services. Efforts include: preventing family dissolution with supportive and emergency services to provide permanent suitable placement for children; and improving the quality of services and service delivery approaches for runaway and homeless youth and children in day care.

Funding

Research, demonstration, dissemination, utilization and technical assistance grants are awarded competitively to public and private non-profit agencies including state and local governments, universities and voluntary agencies.

Appropriations for the past five Fiscal Years for the Child Welfare Research and Demonstration program were:

1982	$7.1 million
1983	10.6 million
1984	10.0 million
1985	12.0 million
1986	8.4 million

For Fiscal Year 1987, exact expenditure levels for the program are not yet known because grants are available throughout the Fiscal Year. However, the Office of Human Development Services estimates that expenditures for the program will be about the same as Fiscal Year 1986.

For Fiscal 1988, the Administration has proposed consolidating Child Welfare Research and Demonstration efforts with other programs under a generic $2.2 billion appropriation request.

ADOPTION OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM

Background

The Adoption Opportunities Program attempts to eliminate barriers to adoption and help find permanent homes for children who would benefit by adoption, particularly children with special needs. The three major program areas are developing and implementing (1) a national adoption and foster care data gathering and analysis system; (2) a national adoption information exchange system; and (3) an adoption training and technical assistance program.

Activities in these three areas are supported by grants and contracts awarded through competitive review to public and private non-profit agencies, including state and local governments, universities and voluntary agencies.

Funding

Funding for the Adoption Opportunities Program for the past five Fiscal Years was:

1982	$1.9 million
1983	1.9 million
1984	1.9 million
1985	2.0 million
1986	1.4 million

For Fiscal Year 1987, the Office of Human Development Services estimates that the program will award approximately the same number of contracts and grants as in the previous Fiscal Year—approximately $1.4 million.

For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration has proposed consolidating the Adoption Opportunities Program with other programs under a generic $2.2 billion appropriation request.

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Background

Created in April of 1986, the Family Support Administration (FSA) is responsible for providing cash assistance and supportive services to low-income families. The creation of FSA brought the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program from the Social Security Administration to the Department of Health and Human Services.

The AFDC program provides cash support for low-income families with dependent children who have been deprived of parental support due to death, disability, or continued absence of a parent. States also have the option to allow AFDC payments if the principal wage earner of the family is unemployed. Specific eligibility criteria and payment levels are set by the states and benefit costs are jointly financed by the federal government.

Funding

For Fiscal Year 1986, funding for AFDC benefits was $8.14 billion, with an additional $1.02 billion for administration of the program, making the total available $9.16 billion.

For Fiscal 1987, funding for AFDC benefits is set at $8.73 billion, with an additional $1.04 billion for administration, making the total available $9.77 billion.

For Fiscal 1988, the Administration proposes to reduce funding for AFDC benefits by $414 million—to $8.31 billion—and to increase funding for AFDC administration to $1.05 billion.

U.S. Department of Education

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Department of Education, established by the Department of Education Organization Act in October of 1979, administers and coordinates most Federal assistance to education. Programs of the Department of Education fall into seven major categories:

1) Elementary and Secondary Education;
2) Special Education and Rehabilitative Services;
3) Postsecondary Education;
4) Bilingual Education;
5) Education Research and Improvement;
6) Vocational Education; and
7) Adult Education.

Current funding for the Department of Education is $19.5 billion, with a proposed cut in Fiscal Year 1988 to $14.0 billion. Current priorities of the Department of Education include:

—Emphasizing support for programs that enhance educational opportunities for the poor, disadvantaged, and handicapped;
—Giving priority to elementary and secondary education programs because of the importance of the early years of learning;
—Enhancing activities that promote educational quality, through flexible block grant programming authority, improved teacher training support, and better research and statistics;
—Focusing Federal student aid subsidies only on the neediest students; and
—Eliminating drugs from schools.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Approximately 40 percent of the Department of Education's budget is allocated for direct educational services to elementary and secondary school children. These programs are mainly designed to assist states in meeting the special needs of poor and disadvantaged children, and assist states in raising the overall quality of educational services. In addition, with the passage of the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act in the fall of 1986, the Department began providing funds to states and localities to develop drug prevention programs, provide training to school officials, and support a variety of research and information efforts related to eliminating drugs from schools.

Chapter 1 Programs

Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) provides financial assistance to local school districts for compensatory education services for disadvantaged students and to state educational agencies for special educational services for children of migratory workers, handicapped children in state-operated programs, and neglected or delinquent children under state care. Funds are allocated through a statutory formula based on each state's per-pupil expenditure for education and its enrollment of eligible children.

According to surveys conducted by the Department of Education, approximately 70 percent of Chapter 1 funds serve students in elementary grades 1-8. The Department also estimates that *Chapter 1 serves only about 40 percent of the eligible population* (those scoring less than 50 percent on various standard tests).

Current funding for Chapter 1 programs is $3.94 billion. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration has requested $4.14 billion—a $200 million increase over the current appropriation.

A state allocation table may be found in the Appendix.

Chapter 2 Programs

The Chapter 2 State Block Grant program provides funds to states to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education for children in public and private schools. It is intended to promote general excellence in education, rather than to support various categorical activities.

Awards to states are based on the population of school-age children. Within-state allocations to local school districts are based on enrollments in public and private schools adjusted by state-determined factors to give added weight to students whose education imposes a higher-than-average cost.

Current funding for Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act is $500 million. The Administration's Fiscal Year 1988 request is the same as the 1987 allocation.

Secretary of Education's Discretionary Fund

The Chapter 2 Secretary's Discretionary Fund supports five mandated programs and other discretionary projects carried out at the national level:

—The *Inexpensive Book Distribution Program* is administered through a contract with Reading is Fundamental, Inc. (RIF), a non-profit organization affiliated with the Smithsonian Institution. RIF allocates funds to local community associations, which select and distribute inexpensive books to children from low-income families.

—The *Arts in Education* program supports two activities: (1) Very Special Arts, which develops programs that integrate the arts into the general education of disabled children and the lives of disabled adults; and (2) the John F. Kennedy Center's education program, which supports a network of state arts education committees and programs for children.

—The *Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education program* supports the operation of regional training centers and a national support center for information on alcohol and drug abuse. Under the Administration's Fiscal 1988 budget, this program would not be funded in 1988.

—The *Law-Related Education program* makes competitive awards for programs designed to provide children and adults with knowledge and skills pertaining to the law, the legal process, the legal system, and the principles and values on which they are based.

—The *National Diffusion Network* provides for support of exemplary educational projects and practices and dissemination of information about these projects and practices to school districts, schools, and practitioners.

In addition to the mandated programs, discretionary projects include the elementary and secondary school recognition programs, field-initiated grants, and Presidential Scholars program.

Funding for the above programs is currently at $29.3 million. For 1988, the funding level is expected to remain the same.

Drug-Free Schools and Communities

The Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act requires the Department of Education to provide state and local grants as well as certain national activities directed toward eliminating drugs from schools. Current funding for this program is $200 million—with $161 million for state and local grants and the remainder for national programs. The Administration has requested $100 million for Fiscal Year 1988 to continue these programs.

Teacher Training and Improvement

At least 80 percent of the funds allocated for teacher training and improvement are used for inservice education for teachers and administrators to improve their subject matter competence and teaching and administrative skills; retraining teachers who wish to move into new subject areas; and programs for persons outside the teaching profession who wish to enter teaching but lack course work in education.

At the national level, up to 20 percent of the funds are set aside for nationally significant projects of research, development and testing, demonstration projects, data collection, and dissemination. Activities also include summer institutes for advanced study by teachers and administrators, development of industry-education exchange programs, and model programs to train teachers in maintaining an orderly classroom environment.

Current funding for teacher training and improvement is $91.2 million. The Administration has requested $80 million for Fiscal Year 1988.

Indian Education

The Indian Education Act authorizes a variety of programs designed to improve educational opportunities for Indian children. These programs include: supplementary programs in local educational agencies; enrichment programs in Indian-controlled schools; special educational services to Indian children; training for Indian educational personnel; fellowships for Indian students; and regional resource and evaluation centers that provide technical assistance to other projects funded under the Act.

Funding for this program is currently at $64 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration has requested $64.2 million for these programs (an additional $200,000 for administrative costs).

Impact Aid

The Impact Aid program provides grants to local educational agencies to compensate them when Federal activities result in increased enrollments or loss of local revenues. Districts that have suffered damage to their facilities from natural disasters also receive assistance under this program.

Current funding for this program is $717.5 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration's request is $548 million, with major reductions planned for all categories of impact aid.

Magnet Schools Assistance

The Magnet Schools Assistance program authorizes grants to local educational agencies for use in magnet school programs that are part of desegregation plans approved by courts or the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights. Funds are used for conducting academic and vocational programs in magnet schools,

including planning and promotional activities, teachers' salaries, and the purchase of books, materials, and equipment.

Funding for Magnet Schools Assistance is currently at $75 million. The Administration's Fiscal Year 1988 budget request maintains this funding level.

Elementary and Secondary Education Programs Scheduled for Elimination

The Department of Education *proposes to eliminate* several other programs under the category of elementary and secondary education. These include:

—*High School Equivalency Program*. Provides support to low-income migrant and seasonal farmworkers to gain high school diplomas or equivalent certificates. Current funding is $6.3 million.

—*Women's Educational Equity Program*. Provides educational equity for girls and women through grants and contracts to public agencies, private nonprofit organizations, and individuals for curriculum materials, training programs, and other written and audiovisual materials. Funding for this program is currently $3.5 million.

—*Training and Advisory Services (Title IV of the Civil Rights Act)* Provides grants to state educational agencies and desegregation assistance centers which, in turn, provide technical assistance and training to school districts that are desegregating in the areas of race, sex, or national origin. Current funding for this program is $24 million.

—*General Assistance to the Virgin Islands*. Provides general support for elementary and secondary education in the Virgin Islands. Current funding for this program is $5 million.

—*Ellender Fellowships*. Provides aid to low-income students and their teachers to enable them to participate in week-long seminars in Washington. Current funding for this program is $1.7 million.

—*Follow Through Program*. An experimental program to design and disseminate outstanding models of compensatory education for low-income children in the early elementary grades. Current funding for this program is $7.2 million.

—*Immigrant and Refugee Education*. Provides grants to states for distribution to school districts enrolling substantial numbers of immigrant children. Current funding for this program is $45.9 million.

SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

The Department of Education provides block grants to states to provide services to those who require special education and/or rehabilitative services. In addition, the Department provides direct funding to several institutions that provide educational services to handicapped individuals. In particular, the Department continues to emphasize early childhood education, transition services and supported employment of disabled workers.

However, the Administration is proposing to eliminate several programs that provide special education and rehabilitation services to individuals. The Administration has requested significant funding reductions in many of the following programs for Fiscal Year 1988.

Education for the Handicapped

This program provides formula grants to states to assist them in providing a free public education and related services to all handicapped children aged 3 through 21. An estimated 4.1 million handicapped children qualify for assistance under the program.

Current funding for the program provides a Federal share of the total per pupil cost of educating handicapped children of about 4 percent.

Funding for the Education for the Handicapped formula grants is currently at $1.3 billion. For Fiscal Year 1988, the funding request for these programs is $1.3 billion.

Education for the Handicapped Preschool Grants

Formula grants are awarded to states to assist them in providing special education and related services to preschool children. Funds are awarded based on the number of handicapped children in the age range 3 through 5 served in each state plus the estimated number of children in that age group who will be served.

Preschool grants supplement funds provided under the State Grant program for services to these children. The grants are intended to encourage states to expand early childhood services.

Current funding for the program is $180 million. The Administration's budget request for these grants for Fiscal Year 1988 is $85.5 million—a significant decrease from current funding levels.

Education for the Handicapped Grants for Infants and Families

This new program is designed to make formula grants to states for developing and implementing statewide systems of coordinated, comprehensive, multi-disciplinary interagency programs to provide early intervention, health, and social services to all handicapped children from birth through 2 years of age and their families.

Funding for this program is currently at $50 million. The Administration has proposed to eliminate this program in Fiscal Year 1988.

Education for the Handicapped Special Purpose Funds

Special Purpose Funds support a variety of research, demonstration, and training activities that complement the State Grant programs. These discretionary programs support activities undertaken at the national level.

Current funding for these activities is $173.9 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration has requested $143.3 million for these activities.

Vocational Rehabilitation Services State Grants

The Vocational Rehabilitation State Grant program provides funds to state vocational rehabilitation agencies to help physically and mentally disabled persons become gainfully employed. Funds are distributed on the basis of a formula that takes into account population and per capita income. Under the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1986, at least one-quarter of one percent of the funds must be set aside for grants to Indian tribes.

Services provided include vocational evaluation, counseling and guidance, work adjustment, physical and mental restoration, education and vocational training, job placement, and post-employment services.

Current funding for these state grants is $1.3 billion. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration has requested a funding level of $1.2 billion for vocational rehabilitation services state grants.

Vocational Rehabilitation Services Special Purpose Funds

Client Assistance formula grants are made to states for programs to inform and advise clients of benefits available to them under the Rehabilitation Act and to assist them in their relationships with service providers.

Discretionary Grants are made for service and demonstration programs to expand services to disabled migrants, develop new and innovative approaches to meeting the needs of severely disabled persons, and involve private employers in providing special training and job placement opportunities to disabled persons.

The Hellen Keller Center is also partly supported by Vocational Rehabilitation Services Special Purpose Funds and provides comprehensive services to deaf-blind youths and adults. The Center also provides personnel training and conducts research.

Independent Living Awards include formula grants to the states for independent living services, discretionary grants to support a network of nonresidential, community-based independent living centers, and discretionary grants for independent living services to older blind persons. Persons who receive independent living services are severely disabled and need assistance to enable them to live more independently in family and community settings.

Training Grants are made to states and public or other nonprofit agencies and organizations, including institutions of higher education, to help ensure that adequate skilled personnel are available to provide rehabilitation services to disabled persons.

Funding for Vocational Rehabilitation Services Special Purpose Funds is currently $133.1 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration is requesting a total of $124.4 million for these programs.

National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research

The purpose of the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research is to provide for a comprehensive and coordinated approach to the administration and conduct of research, demonstration projects, and related activities concerning the rehabilitation of disabled persons, including training of persons who provide rehabilitation services or who conduct rehabilitation research.

Discretionary grants are awarded for support of research and training centers, rehabilitation engineering centers, and research and demonstration projects.

Funding for the Institute is currently $48.5 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the same level of funding has been requested by the Administration.

Special Institutions for the Handicapped

Institutions funded under this category include:

The American Printing House for the Blind, in Louisville, Kentucky, provides books, magazines, cassettes and other materials for blind students. Each state receives an allotment which can be used to purchase materials for its students from the Printing House.

The National Technical Institute for the Deaf, in Rochester, New York, provides postsecondary technical education to deaf students. Federal funds account for 84 percent of its budget.

Gallaudet University, located in Washington, D.C. is a private, nonprofit liberal arts institution offering college preparatory, undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education programs for the deaf. Gallaudet also maintains and operates the Model Secondary School for the Deaf which provides educational programs which are specifically designed for deaf teenagers, and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School which provides educational programs specifically designed for deaf elementary children.

Current total funding for these institutions is $99.5 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration has requested $101.5 million.

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

The focus of most the the Department of Education's involvement with postsecondary education programs is in the form of various loan and grant programs designed to support both institutions and individuals. Currently, *about one-third of all postsecondary student costs are met by Federal grants or loans.*

Pell Grants

The Pell Grant program provides portable, voucher-like grant aid to needy undergraduate students. Grant amounts vary in direct proportion to the students family financial circumstances. As such, this is the Department of Education's most strictly need-focused student aid program, designed to promote the financial accessibility of higher education for students from low-income families.

Current funding for the Pell Grant program is $3.8 billion. The Administration's Fiscal Year 1988 request is $2.7 billion—a reduction of over $1 billion.

Income-Contingent/Perkins (Direct) Loans

The Department of Education is responsible for two loan programs: (1) Income-Contingent Loans, created by the Higher Education Amendments of 1986; and (2) Perkins Loans, formerly Direct Loans, initiated under the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Income-Contingent Loans. Under this program, institutions are responsible for collecting loans and administering revolving loan funds from which new loans are made. Institutions must match Federal capital contributions at the rate of one institutional dollar for every nine Federal dollars. Schools may use up to five percent of their awards to meet related administrative expenses. Loan amounts are limited to $2,500 for the first year, $3,500 for the second year, and $4,000 for each of up to three additional undergraduate years, with an overall $17,500 aggregate limit. There is no time limit on repayment.

Current funding for Income-Contingent Loans is $5 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration is proposing to dramatically expand the loan program to $600 million per year, with an additional $70 million available from Federal collections.

Perkins (Direct) Loans. Currently, some 3,300 participating institutions administer Perkins Loan revolving funds with total assets now exceding $5 billion. Cumulative borrowing is limited to $4,500 for the first two years, $9,000 for under- graduate study, and $18,000 for the combination of graduate and undergraduate study. Interest is currently 5 percent during principal payment and zero during in-school, grace and deferment periods.

Current funding for Perkins Loans is $188 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration proposes the elimination of Perkins Loans and emphasizes Income- Contingent Loans instead.

Guaranteed Student Loans

The Guaranteed Student Loan program subsidizes and guarantees low interest loans to students and their parents which are made by commercial and nonprofit lenders. The program continues to be the single largest source of Federal student aid. There are four program components: (l) regular loans under which the Federal government pays the interest while the student is in school and during certain grace and deferment periods; (2) unsubsidized Parent Loans for Undergraduate Students (PLUS); (3) unsubsidized Supplemental Loans for Students (SLS); and (4) Consolidation Loans under which borrowers with multiple student loans and meeting certain criteria may have their obligations consolidated and their repayment schedules extended.

Current funding for the Guaranteed Student Loan program is $3 billion. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration proposes $1.8 billion for the program. Current new loan volume is $9.2 billion. The proposed Administration budget provides a new loan volume in Fiscal Year 1988 of $9.0 billion.

Work-Study and Supplemental Grants

The Work-Study and Supplemental Grants programs are "campus-based" grants in that they are administered largely by the participating educational institutions using yearly allocations of Federal funds.

The Supplemental Grants program provides grant assistance of up to $4,000 per academic year to undergraduate students who demonstrate general need under a statutory need analysis system. Unlike Pell Grants, the exact grant amount does not vary directly with family circumstances, but is left to the discretion of the institutional financial aid administrator.

Under the program, the participating institutions use these funds to provide up to 80 percent of the salaries of undergraduate or graduate students working part-time, generally in on-campus jobs. The remaining 20 percent of salary is provided by the school or other employer.

Current funding for the Work-Study and Suplemental Grants program is $412 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration proposes no funding for the program—thus its elimination.

State Student Incentive Grants

The State Student Incentive Grant program provides incentives to states to develop state-level need-based postsecondary student grant programs. State grant amounts are matched by Federal funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

Funding for this grant program is currently $76 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration proposes no funding for the program.

Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students

These programs provide funding for various post-secondary education outreach and student support services designed to promote college completion on the part of individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Current funding for these programs is $176.4 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration has proposed a significant reduction in funding for these programs—$82.4 million.

Title III: Support for Developing Institutions

For over 20 years, Title III funds have been given to selected institutions in order to support temporary developmental needs of institutions primarily serving the disadvantaged.

Fiscal Year 1987 funding for this program is $146.2 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration proposes a reduction in funding to $50.7 million, focused solely on historically black colleges and universities, and eliminating other types of institutions.

Minority Institutions Science Improvement

This program provides financial assistance to projects at postsecondary institutions with predominantly minority enrollments in order to enhance the capacity of such institutions to develop and maintain quality science education programs as well as to help increase the representation of ethnic minorities in science and engineering careers.

Current funding for this program is $5 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration has requested the same level of funding.

Howard University

Howard University, located in Washington, D.C. has over 13,000 students enrolled in 17 undergraduate and professional schools. It also operates a teaching hospital. Approximately 60 percent of the expenses of the academic program are derived from direct Federal appropriation.

Current Federal support for Howard University is $170.2 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration has proposed the same funding level.

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education stimulates institutions of higher education to identify and pursue educational quality improvements.

Current funding for the program is $12.2 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration has proposed a reduction in funding to $7.5 million.

Programs Proposed by the Administration for Elimination:

Veterans' Education Outreach. Assists postsecondary institutional tutoring and counseling service programs responding to special educational needs of Vietnam-era veterans. Current funding is $3 million.

Cooperative Education. Assists institutions in operating cooperative education programs. Current funding is $14.4 million.

International Education and Foreign Language Studies. Provides funds to institutions to establish and maintain foreign language studies and international education programs. Current funding for the program is $32.1 million.

Law School Clinical Experience. Created to stimulate the creation of clinical experience programs in law schools. Current funding is $1.5 million.

Legal Training for the Disadvantaged. Current funding is $1.5 million.

Higher Education Facilities Program. Provides Federal funding for facilities loans and insurance, facilities grants, and college housing loans. Current funding is $42.2 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration has proposed eliminating funding for all but the interest subsidies for the program.

Patricia Roberts Harris Public Service Fellowships. Designed to provide support for applicants for public service employment training. Current funding is $2.5 million.

Jacob K. Javits Fellows. Provides support grants for Ph.D's in the area of arts, humanities, and social sciences. Current funding is $3.4 million.

Patricia Roberts Harris Graduate Fellowships. Provides grants to aid graduate and professional students in various fields. Current funding is $11.8 million.

Congressional Teacher Scholarships. Awards scholarships to outstanding high school graduates interested in teaching careers at the elementary and secondary level. Current funding is $15.5 million.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Bilingual education programs are designed to aid children who are not proficient in English to learn the language as soon as possible. In recent years, several organizations have supported the right of local communities to decide how best to educate their limited English proficient children. In 1984, Congress added "special alternative instructional programs to transitional bilingual education" to permit states to adopt alternative approaches to bilingual education programs.

Current funding for bilingual education is $143.1 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, the Administration has requested the same amount.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The Department of Education currently supports vocational education programs and projects, including basic state grants, grants to community-based organizations, consumer and homemaking education, state councils, research and demonstration programs, data collection systems, and bilingual vocational training.

Current funding for these programs is $882 million. For Fiscal Year 1988, *the Administration has requested terminating funding for all vocational education programs.* Justification provided by the Administration for eliminating the programs is as follows:

—Funds provided by the Department of Education for vocational education have become a smaller percentage of all funds devoted to vocational education.

—The Department of Labor spends approximately $3.2 billion for job training programs.

—Private industry currently spends $30-40 billion annually for training programs.

—Budget circumstances make it difficult to justify the singling out of vocational instruction to receive categorical funding.

U. S. Department of Justice

BACKGROUND

The Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) is responsible for programs designed to prevent child abuse and for providing guidance regarding the issues of juvenile justice and delinquency.

The OJJDP was established by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 in response to national concern about juvenile crime and delinquency. The Act requires that the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention:

—Coordinate Federal delinquency programs,
—Provide formula grants to states to aid in delinquency prevention,
—Provide special emphasis discretionary funds,
—Provide technical assistance to governmental and nongovernmental agencies in the areas of juvenile justice and delinquency,
—Design and coordinate centralized research efforts that deal with the problems of juvenile delinquency,
—Evaluate juvenile justice programs,
—Provide training for juvenile justice practitioners and others,
—Develop standards for juvenile justice; and
—Disseminate information on delinquency and juvenile justice programs.

FUNDING LEVELS

Every year since the last year of the Carter Administration, the Administration has requested zero funding for OJJDP. Each year, Congress restores their funding. This makes multi-year program planning impossible; in 1986 OJJDP published no program plan.

Current (1986/87) funding levels are as follows:

Formula Grants	$42,960,000
Discretionary, special emphasis	14,320,000
Technical Assistance	2,000,000
National Institute of Justice	7,731,000
Concentration of Federal Efforts	589,000
Subtotal	67,600,000
Administration	2,682,000
Total	$70,282,000

FUNCTIONS

The Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) consists of four divisions: the Special Emphasis Division; the State Relations and Assistance Division; the Training, Dissemination and Technical Assistance Division; and the Research and Program Development Division. The latter two divisions make up the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NIJJDP), the research and data collection component of OJJDP.

The Special Emphasis Division provides discretionary funds directly to public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals to encourage new approaches to delinquency prevention and control. The Division is currently developing, testing, and implementing various research and demonstration programs in such areas as chronic juvenile offenders, school crime, and the exploitation of children.

The State Relations and Assistance Division provides funds to states participating in implementing the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974. The Division provides assistance to the states in such areas as the deinstitutionalization of status offenders and the removal of juveniles from adult jails.

The Training Dissemination and Technical Assistance Division is responsible for programs for training professional, paraprofessional, and volunteer personnel, and others who work with juvenile offenders and their families. This division also serves as a clearinghouse for publishing and disseminating information regarding juvenile delinquency. The division also provides technical assistance to Federal, state, and local governments, courts, public and private agencies, institutions, and individuals in planning, establishing, funding, operating, and evaluating juvenile delinquency programs.

The Research and Program Development Division develops estimates and monitors trends in juvenile delinquency in the U.S.; improves understanding of the causes of juvenile delinquency and development of delinquent and criminal careers; develops prevention strategies; improves the justice system's handling of juvenile offenders; and develops alternatives for the national juvenile justice system. Under each of the above objectives, the Division focuses special attention on serious juvenile crime.

In addition to the technical assistance and data gathering functions mentioned above, the OJJDP is responsible for the Concentration of Federal Effort Program and the Missing and Exploited Children's Program.

PROGRAMS

The Concentration of Federal Effort Program was established by Congress to encourage interagency communication and collaboration in dealing with problems associated with juvenile delinquency and crime. The core of the CFE Program is a Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The purpose of the Council is to coordinate all Federal juvenile delinquency programs, and, in consultation with the Advisory Board on Missing Children, all Federal programs related to missing and exploited children.

The 18 member Council is chaired by the Attorney General. The Vice Chairman is the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

The Concentration of Federal Effort Program, through the Coordinating Council, is designed to assist agencies that have direct responsibility for juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment programs, and to implement programs among and between departments and agencies that may have an important bearing on the success of the overall Federal juvenile delinquency effort.

Through the Concentration of Federal Effort Program, OJJDP has recently managed and contributed funding to the following Interagency Agreements:

OJJDP/Drug Enforcement Administration
$200,000
10/10/84 - 6/2/87
Jointly sponsor a drug abuse prevention effort in the Nation's high schools by training high school athletic coaches in drug intervention techniques.

OJJDP/Bureau of Indian Affairs
$150,000
8/12/85 - 8/11/86
Funds provided to the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs to assist with training teachers and/or youth workers on substance abuse prevention techniques.

OJJDP/Health and Human Services
$30,000
3/4/85 - 9/1/86
Assist with the support of a Surgeon General's study of the effects of pornography and its relationship to violence committed against children.

OJJDP/Bureau of Justice Statistics
$1,640,000
Provides funds to support a cooperative venture among OJJDP, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, and the Bureau of the Census designed to improve the accuracy and utility of juvenile statistics and correctional facilities.

OJJDP/Department of Education
$449,867
11/1/85 - 9/30/86
Provided for a competition among high school students to demonstrate their understanding of the law and the Constitution.

OJJDP/Health and Human Services/ Education/Labor
$2,746,692
1984 - 1986
Supports "Cities in Schools"—a program that identifies potential dropouts and places them in a program that encourages a work/study arrangement.

OJJDP/Treasury
$1,530,000
7/1/82 - 11/30/87
Provides funds for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to provide training seminars and technical assistance to state and local law enforcement on a wide range of juvenile justice issues including child abuse.

In addition to the above grants, OJJDP has recently awarded a contract to the Aspen Systems Corporation of Rockville, Maryland to provide staff support, technical services and assistance, and management of an expert-resource consulting pool for evaluation, review, and assistance to the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NIJJDP) projects. Under the contract, Aspen Systems Corporation also provides staff support to two major advisory pannels—the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the Missing Children's Advisory Board—and the recently formed National Partnership to Prevent Drug and Alcohol Abuse. The contract amount is $1,199,963 and the grant award period is 9/15/85 - 9/15/87.

The Missing and Exploited Children's Program was created by the Missing Children's Assistance Act of 1984. The purpose of the program is to coordinate the efforts of all Federal agencies as well as other public and private initiatives involving missing and exloited children's issues. Specifically, the program is mandated to:

—Analyze, compile, publish and disseminate an annual summary of recently completed and ongoing research, and of Federal, state, and local demonstration projects.
—Conduct periodic national incidence studies on the number of children reported missing each year, the number abducted by strangers, the number of parental kidnappings, and the number of children recovered each year.
—Provide the means to facilitate effective coordination among all federally funded programs relating to miss-

ing children and prepare an annual comprehensive plan for facilitating such coordination.

—Establish and maintain a national toll-free information and reporting line.

—Support the U.S. Attorney General's Advisory Board on Missing Children.

—Authorize grants in the areas of awareness, education, information collection and dissemination, and data collection regarding missing and exploited children's issues.

In addition, the Missing Children's Assistance Act also requires that OJJDP establish and operate a national resource center and clearinghouse designed to:

—Provide technical assistance to state and local governments, public and private nonprofit agencies, and individuals in locating and recovering missing children.

—Coordinate public and private programs that locate, recover, or reunite missing children with their legal custodians.

—Disseminate information about innovative and model missing children's programs, services, and legislation, and

—Provide technical assistance to law enforcement agencies, state and local governments, elements of the criminal justice system, public nonprofit agencies, and individuals in the prevention, investigation, prosecution, and treatment of the missing and exploited child case.

Finally, the Missing Children's Assistance Act also required the Attorney General to set up a 9-member Advisory Board on missing children responsible for advising the Attorney General and the OJJDP Administrator in coordinating Federal programs and activities, advising the OJJDP Administrator regarding the establishment of priorities for making grants or contracts for projects, and approving an annual comprehensive plan for facilitating cooperation and coordination among all agencies and organizations. This activity was funded at the $4 million level in 1985, 1986, and 1987, and the same amount was requested again in the Administration's 1988 budget.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

OJJDP operates a "consulting pool" comprised of experienced professionals with substantive expertise in specific areas of juvenile and criminal justice to provide technical assistance to Federal, state and local governments, public and private agencies, as well as to courts, institutions, and individuals for use in planning, establishing, operating and/or evaluating juvenile delinquency programs.

These experts are called on for short-term technical assistance assignments when OJJDP staff determine that expertise is needed that falls outside the capabilities of Agency staff, when grantees require training in an area that demands a highly specialized background, or when time constraints require special assistance.

Primary technical assistance experts and special emphasis grant amounts include:

National Center for Juvenile Justice
National Juvenile Court Data
July 1978- October 1986
Total $2,664,093

National Office for Social Responsibility
Private Sector
January 1986 - July 1987
Total $901,899

Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation Restitution
September 1984 - September 1986
Total $1,399,979

National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise
Technical Assistance Voucher Demonstration
May 1984 - September 1986
Total $839,929

National Center for Missing and Exploited Children
March 1984 - March 1987
Total $6,343,173

National Criminal Justice Reference Service/ Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse
April 1984 - May 1987
Total $3,486,348

In addition, OJJDP provides several other large grants to support its activities for child safety and education. These include:

National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
Permanent Families for Abused and Neglected Children Program
Funded from 1984 through February 1988
Total $5.5 million

National School Safety Center
Pepperdine
January 1984 through present
Total $3.8 million

Law-Related Education Programs
Grants to five organizations since 1979
Total $10 million

U.S. Department of Defense

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Department of Defense is involved in various youth activities/issues as they relate to military families, the quality of future recruits, and literacy/basic skills training. Following is an overview of the Department of Defense's efforts affecting young people.

—***Military Families.*** DOD provides information about child abuse and child neglect for military families. To carry out this task, the Department has established a DOD Family Advocacy Program (FAP) and the Family Advocacy Committee. A Military Family Resource Center was also recently established.

—***Interagency Cooperative Efforts.*** The Department has recently entered into an Interagency Agreement with the Department of Health and Human Services and signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Agriculture's Extension Service for various family support activities including cooperative efforts in the area of adoptions, child abuse prevention, child care, youth services, programs for developmentally disabled, and other family support activities. A joint services task force will be established to develop initiatives in each of these areas.

—***Commitment to Personal Excellence.*** As described by Admiral James D. Watkins, former Chief of Naval Operations, at a recent **Youth: 2000** conference in Washington, D.C., the Navy plans a "Commitment to Personal Excellence" initiative, focusing on basic education, fitness, and ethical conduct.

—***Literacy.*** Military services spend over $25 million each year to provide computer-driven basic skills enhancement to trainees.

MILITARY FAMILIES

Policy

In November of 1986, DOD established the DOD Family Advocacy Program (FAP), the Family Advocacy Committee, and the Military Family Resource Center. Although these units deal with many issues related to military families, a significant portion of their activities focus on youth. For Fiscal Year 1987, the DOD has allocated approximately $15 million for various programs to assist military families. Because the Administration's budget for Fiscal 1988 does not contain specific funding levels for these various programs, exact figures for Fiscal 1988 are not available, although the Department expects to devote about the same level of resources as in Fiscal 1987.

In establishing these components, the Department states its position on issues relating to child abuse, including:

—Preventing child and spouse abuse involving military personnel and their families;
—Directing the development of programs and activities that contribute to healthy family lives;
—Providing a coordinated and comprehensive Department of Defense child and spouse abuse program;
—Promoting early identification and intervention in cases of alleged child abuse; and
—Providing programs of rehabilitation and treatment for child and spouse abuse programs.

Family Advocacy Program

The Secretary of each Military Department has been directed to establish a Family Advocacy Program—a program designed to address prevention, identification, evaluation, treatment, rehabilitation, follow-up, and reporting of family violence, particularly child neglect and abuse. Family Advocacy Programs consist of coordinated efforts designed to prevent and intervene in cases of family distress, and to promote healthy family life. The Family Advocacy Program includes the following efforts:

1) *Prevention.* Efforts to prevent child and spouse abuse, including information and education about the problem in general. Prevention efforts are specifically directed toward potential victims, offenders, and non-offending family members.
2) *Direct Service.* Identification, diagnosis, treatment, counseling, rehabilitation, follow-up, and other services directed toward the victims and perpetrators of abuse and their families. These services are supplemented locally by a multidisciplinary case review committee established to assess incidents of alleged abuse and make determinations and recommendations for treatment and case management.
3) *Administration.* Needs assessments, program evaluation, research and other activities to support Family Advocacy Program evaluation and training, including all educational measures, services, or supplies used to prepare or maintain the skills of personnel working in the Family Advocacy Program.

Department of Defense Family Advocacy Committee

The DOD Family Advocacy Committee is a body of representatives from all military service branches (including the Coast Guard) and other designated members chaired by the Director of the Military Family Resource Center, responsible for advising the Assistant Secretary of Defense on the status of Family Advocacy Programs, and assisting with the coordination of special advocacy projects.

Military Family Resource Center

The functions of the Military Family Resource Center are to:

—Collaborate with Federal and state agencies that address family advocacy issues;
—Collect and maintain family advocacy-related resource and research materials;
—Publish a family advocacy newsletter, "Military Family"; and
—Provide guidance and technical assistance to Family Advocacy Program staff and managers.

INTERAGENCY ACTIVITIES

In November of 1986, the DOD entered into an Interagency Agreement with the Department of Health and Human Services and signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. Both agreements expanded family support activities through mutual assistance and joint efforts. No funding is involved in either of these activities.

Agreement With the Department of Health and Human Services

The Interagency Agreement between the DOD and the Department of Health and Human Services focuses on improving services to military families by exchanging existing expertise in programs and research in various areas. In November of 1985, a Task Force was formed between the Army and the Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children, Youth, and Families. The goals of the Task Force are:

—Improvement of coordination between civilian and military child abuse and neglect officials;
—Use of the Head Start Child Development Associate (CDA) credentialling program to update child care in the Services by adapting materials to expand preparation of candidates for Child Development Associate certification, training of child care staff, and developing a monitoring process to determine the effectiveness of the Child Development Associate training;
—Adaptation of Head Start parenting curricula to the needs of military families;
—Linkage of military installations to local civilian runaway and homeless youth shelters to ensure that working agreements are developed at the local level to address the need for services and support for families with troubled or abused children and adolescents, and training for staff working with potential runaway or suicidal pre-adolescents and adolescents;
—Improvement of adoption opportunities for military families, including adoption of special needs children by supporting an educational campaign for military families and adoption agencies to increase the understanding of the opportunities for and barriers to adoption. Explore approaches to increase the reciprocal acceptance, across agencies and states, of a home study assessment which certifies a family as eligible to adopt.

The Departments of Defense and Health and Human services also agreed to establish a task force to implement the Interagency Agreement. The responsibilities of the task force are to:

—Increase collaboration between civilian child protective services and military family advocacy programs;
—Support cooperation between military installations and civilian runaway and homeless youth centers;
—Disseminate family life curricula and materials;
—Support cooperation between military installations and civilian runaway and homeless youth centers;
—Improve adoption opportunities for military parents, to include special needs adoptions, by supporting an educational campaign for military families and adoption agencies to increase the understanding of the opportunities for and barriers to adoption;
—Conduct joint demonstration projects and other special initiatives;
—Develop linkages between civilian programs and the Department of Defense's programs for developmentally disabled and other handicapped persons, including improved civilian employment opportunities for developmentally disabled and other handicapped persons;
—Expand current efforts to support families through joint HHS/DOD drug and alcohol prevention and education activities;
—Use the HHS Office of Human Development Services' Child Welfare Service Resource Centers for training, information dissemination, and technical assistance;
—Conduct HHS-DOD conferences, seminars, and other activities with leaders and experts on the problems and strengths of families;

—Consult on legislative and regulatory measures to improve services to families; and
—Review current and future research and potential joint research opportunities.

Memorandum of Understanding With the U.S. Department of Agriculture

In November of 1986, the Department of Defense signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Extension Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture's Extension Service serves as the educational component of the Department and is responsible for carrying out various educational programs in areas such as food and nutrition; financial, resource, and energy management; child development; family life education; and interpersonal and parenting skills for the general public.

The Department of Defense, through its Family Advocacy Program provides services to military families such as family support/service centers, child care, and various youth-related activities.

The understanding between the two agencies encourages cooperative efforts and information-sharing between various service/information providers involved with these issues—with the goal of coordinating efforts to eliminate duplication and waste in achieving the above goals.

There is no funding by either agency involved in the agreement.

PERSONAL EXCELLENCE INITIATIVE

At the recent **Youth: 2000** conference in Washington, D.C., Admiral James D. Watkins (retired), former Chief of Naval Operations, noted that the Navy has long been aware that a well-educated young population is the key for continued national security. As a result, the Navy plans to work closely with private sector organizations and individuals in the following areas:

—Remedial education programs for recruits, focusing on basic skills as opposed to specific training skills; and
—Joining with private and public institutions to enhance education, promote health, reinforce good ethical practices. Specific programs will include expansion of Navy Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps Units (to give high school graduates an early exposure to the Navy); special initiatives with schools; and programs with vocational and technical schools emphasizing math, science, and technology.

LITERACY AND BASIC SKILLS

Branches of the armed services conduct basic skills courses as part of their training programs. The five military services reported a total expenditure of over $25 million on basic skills training for Fiscal Year 1986 (Fiscal 1987 levels are about the same). The Department of the Army has developed a new competency-based approach to education in basic skills entitled the Job Skills Education Program (JSEP). JSEP is a computer-driven basic skills program designed to teach military personnel the academic skills necessary for performance of specific jobs. In addition, most of the competencies are relevant to civilian occupational training as well.

Appendix

A-1
Department of Labor
Job Training Partnership Act—Title IIA—Block Grant

STATE TABLES

State	1986 Actual (7/86-6/87)	1987 Estimate (7/87-6/88)	1988 Request 1/ (7/88-6/89)
Alabama	$44,191,000	$39,769,000	$39,010,000
Alaska	4,896,000	5,296,000	5,371,000
Arizona	18,433,000	20,388,000	20,613,000
Arkansas	20,705,000	21,114,000	21,363,000
California	189,598,000	181,948,000	184,058,000
Colorado	17,145,000	19,773,000	20,006,000
Connecticut	13,010,000	11,709,000	10,538,000
Delaware	4,446,000	4,446,000	4,446,000
District of Columbia	6,537,000	5,883,000	5,926,000
Florida	62,193,000	58,508,000	59,120,000
Georgia	35,029,000	36,679,000	37,061,000
Hawaii	5,268,000	5,742,000	5,798,000
Idaho	7,592,000	8,552,000	8,657,000
Illinois	99,856,000	102,284,000	103,661,000
Indiana	45,011,000	40,508,000	37,967,000
Iowa	20,170,000	21,190,000	21,461,000
Kansas	9,123,000	10,114,000	10,216,000
Kentucky	33,518,000	38,355,000	38,844,000
Louisiana	47,400,000	58,112,000	58,921,000
Maine	7,323,000	6,590,000	6,213,000
Maryland	20,897,000	18,806,000	16,926,000
Massachusetts	27,706,000	24,934,000	22,441,000
Michigan	95,763,000	86,340,000	87,508,000
Minnesota	22,127,000	23,019,000	23,277,000
Mississippi	28,795,000	30,662,000	31,045,000
Missouri	33,249,000	29,923,000	28,419,000
Montana	6,219,000	6,758,000	6,838,000
Nebraska	5,902,000	7,797,000	7,880,000
Nevada	7,064,000	6,953,000	7,045,000
New Hampshire	4,446,000	4,446,000	4,446,000

State	1986 Actual (7/86-6/87)	1987 Estimate (7/87-6/88)	1988 Request 1/ (7/88-6/89)
New Jersey	39,730,000	35,957,000	36,339,000
New Mexico	11,704,000	14,176,000	14,348,000
New York	122,489,000	116,411,000	117,649,000
North Carolina	37,703,000	33,931,000	31,597,000
North Dakota	4,446,000	4,446,000	4,446,000
Ohio	91,248,000	91,671,000	92,894,000
Oklahoma	22,136,000	24,521,000	24,824,000
Oregon	26,487,000	24,547,000	24,870,000
Pennsylvania	97,824,000	88,037,000	87,282,000
Puerto Rico	71,395,000	71,751,000	72,580,000
Rhode Island	5,976,000	5,378,000	4,840,000
South Carolina	22,084,000	23,091,000	23,345,000
South Dakota	4,446,000	4,446,000	4,446,000
Tennessee	40,486,000	39,323,000	39,793,000
Texas	95,882,000	129,290,000	130,932,000
Utah	9,194,000	8,274,000	7,555,000
Vermont	4,446,000	4,446,000	4,446,000
Virginia	26,335,000	28,954,000	29,263,000
Washington	38,477,000	34,628,000	33,682,000
West Virginia	24,773,000	22,295,000	21,574,000
Wisconsin	33,040,000	31,656,000	32,047,000
Wyoming	4,446,000	4,446,000	4,446,000
American Samoa	268,000	241,000	217,000
Guam	1,125,000	1,064,000	1,070,000
Marshall Islands	0	470,000	473,000
Micronesia	0	1,107,000	1,113,000
Northern Marianas	125,000	125,000	125,000
Palau	0	125,000	125,000
Trust Territories	1,648,000	0	0
Virgin Islands	1,560,000	1,595,000	1,604,000
Total	1,783,085,000	1,783,000,000	1,783,000,000

1/ These preliminary amounts are based on currently available labor market information.

A-3

Department of Labor

Job Training Partnership Act—Title IIB—Summer Youth Employment and Training Program

STATE TABLES

State	1986 Estimate (Summer 1987)	1987 Estimate 1/ (Summer 1988)	1988 Request 1/ 2/ (Summer 1989)
Alabama	$13,001,000	$13,578,000	$13,724,000
Alaska	1,761,000	1,865,000	1,887,000
Arizona	6,937,000	7,187,000	7,258,000
Arkansas	7,143,000	7,439,000	7,518,000
California	61,653,000	64,128,000	64,780,000
Colorado	6,691,000	6,970,000	7,040,000
Connecticut	6,540,000	6,016,000	5,414,000
Delaware	1,558,000	1,593,000	1,593,000
District of Columbia	5,419,000	4,984,000	4,486,000
Florida	20,214,000	20,629,000	20,825,000
Georgia	12,541,000	12,933,000	13,055,000
Hawaii	1,974,000	2,025,000	2,043,000
Idaho	2,883,000	3,013,000	3,045,000
Illinois	34,163,000	36,023,000	36,432,000
Indiana	14,900,000	13,706,000	13,354,000
Iowa	7,117,000	7,466,000	7,546,000
Kansas	3,622,000	3,566,000	3,600,000
Kentucky	12,878,000	13,509,000	13,659,000
Louisiana	19,338,000	20,458,000	20,701,000
Maine	2,476,000	2,278,000	2,190,000
Maryland	9,252,000	8,510,000	7,659,000
Massachusetts	13,607,000	12,516,000	11,265,000
Michigan	28,821,000	30,405,000	30,754,000
Minnesota	7,823,000	8,115,000	8,195,000
Mississippi	10,316,000	10,800,000	10,919,000
Missouri	11,247,000	10,346,000	10,010,000
Montana	2,286,000	2,382,000	2,406,000
Nebraska	2,661,000	2,749,000	2,775,000
Nevada	2,327,000	2,449,000	2,476,000
New Hampshire	1,558,000	1,593,000	1,593,000
New Jersey	17,661,000	16,245,000	14,621,000
New Mexico	4,784,000	4,994,000	5,048,000
New York	40,358,000	41,042,000	41,437,000
North Carolina	11,922,000	11,035,000	11,137,000
North Dakota	1,558,000	1,593,000	1,593,000

State	1986 Estimate (Summer 1987)	1987 Estimate (Summer 1988)	1988 Request (Summer 1989)
Ohio	30,647,000	32,287,000	32,651,000
Oklahoma	8,261,000	8,640,000	8,732,000
Oregon	8,220,000	8,646,000	8,743,000
Pennsylvania	29,351,000	30,383,000	30,704,000
Puerto Rico	24,310,000	25,273,000	25,545,000
Rhode Island	2,384,000	2,193,000	1,974,000
South Carolina	7,858,000	8,139,000	8,220,000
South Dakota	1,558,000	1,593,000	1,593,000
Tennessee	13,287,000	13,856,000	14,001,000
Texas	43,440,000	45,548,000	46,043,000
Utah	2,642,000	2,637,000	2,662,000
Vermont	1,558,000	1,593,000	1,593,000
Virginia	10,338,000	10,208,000	10,306,000
Washington	11,175,000	11,718,000	11,845,000
West Virginia	7,108,000	7,495,000	7,582,000
Wisconsin	10,666,000	11,155,000	11,272,000
Wyoming	1,558,000	1,593,000	1,593,000
American Samoa	48,000	49,000	49,000
Guam	589,000	602,000	602,000
Marshall Islands	17,000	18,000	18,000
Micronesia	41,000	42,000	42,000
Northern Marianas	23,000	23,000	23,000
Palau	7,000	7,000	7,000
Virgin Islands	334,000	341,000	341,000
Native Americans	11,566,000	11,821,000	11,821,000
Total	635,976,000	650,000,000	650,000,000

1/ The preliminary amounts are based on currently available labor market information.

2/ Distribution is based on currently authorized program. Legislation is proposed for a new AFDC Youth program. When the legislation is enacted, these funds together with $150 million proposed for later transmittal would be used to support an $800 million AFDC youth effort. A different formula will be used to distribute funds provided for the new program.

A-5

Department of Health and Human Services

Head Start
State Allocations

State	1985 Actual	1986 Estimate	1987 Estimate
Total	$1,046,959,000	$1,013,424,000	$1,046,459,000
Alabama	21,376,133	20,711,097	21,376,133
Alaska	2,242,671	2,172,906	2,242,671
Arizona	9,037,726	8,756,519	9,037,726
Arkansas	10,909,020	10,569,931	10,909,020
California	99,496,463	96,398,576	99,496,463
Colorado	9,606,918	9,307,497	9,606,918
Connecticut	9,910,485	9,602,349	9,910,485
Delaware	2,198,697	2,130,339	2,198,697
Dist. of Columbia	6,174,611	5,982,023	6,174,611
Florida	28,873,182	27,974,240	28,873,182
Georgia	24,822,375	24,049,059	24,822,375
Hawaii	3,929,632	3,807,884	3,929,632
Idaho	2,875,300	2,786,290	2,875,300
Illinois	52,866,457	51,220,730	52,866,457
Indiana	14,525,084	14,072,281	14,525,084
Iowa	7,659,090	7,419,993	7,659,090
Kansas	6,554,286	6,349,549	6,554,286
Kentucky	20,259,751	19,629,439	20,259,751
Louisiana	21,993,563	21,308,769	21,993,563
Maine	4,370,895	4,235,026	4,370,895
Maryland	13,929,304	13,495,566	13,929,304
Massachusetts	23,040,712	22,323,409	23,040,712
Michigan	43,103,561	41,762,247	43,103,561
Minnesota	10,827,275	10,489,802	10,827,275
Mississippi	51,874,113	50,260,141	51,874,113
Missouri	18,158,037	17,592,980	18,158,037
Montana	2,615,332	2,534,641	2,615,332
Nebraska	4,201,254	4,069,814	4,201,254
Nevada	1,480,697	1,434,315	1,480,697
New Hampshire	1,990,641	1,928,940	1,990,641

Head Start
State Allocations

State	1985 Actual	1986 Estimate	1987 Estimate
New Jersey	30,814,901	29,855,824	30,814,901
New Mexico	6,182,774	5,989,925	6,182,774
New York	77,272,388	74,867,672	77,272,388
North Carolina	22,082,675	21,395,029	22,082,675
North Dakota	1,518,482	1,470,891	1,518,482
Ohio	42,697,675	41,367,349	42,697,675
Oklahoma	12,538,005	12,147,789	12,538,005
Oregon	8,282,041	8,024,016	8,282,041
Pennsylvania	44,385,418	43,004,085	44,385,418
Rhode Island	3,402,407	3,296,530	3,402,407
South Carolina	13,683,214	13,257,351	13,683,214
South Dakota	2,405,137	2,330,173	2,405,137
Tennessee	18,515,830	17,939,323	18,515,830
Texas	47,155,713	45,687,730	47,155,713
Utah	4,323,035	4,188,698	4,323,035
Vermont	2,070,686	2,006,424	2,070,686
Virginia	14,835,745	14,373,001	14,835,745
Washington	11,568,581	11,208,386	11,568,581
West Virginia	8,921,212	8,643,732	8,921,212
Wisconsin	15,293,545	14,817,152	15,293,545
Wyoming	1,384,251	1,340,955	1,384,251
Puerto Rico	42,812,188	41,478,198	42,812,188
Virgin Islands	2,193,668	2,125,471	2,193,668
Other Pacific 1/	3,065,345	2,970,593	3,065,345
Amer. Indian Pro.	37,428,528	35,819,101	37,428,528
Migrant Programs	38,878,858	37,206,110	38,878,858
Special Projects	2,343,433	2,236,140	2,343,433

1/ In FY 1986 and FY 1987, some of these funds will be provided by the Department of the Interior, in conjunction with the enactment of the Compact of Free Association.

Runaway and Homeless Youth
State Allocations

State	1985 Actual	1986 Estimate	1987 Estimate
	$18,140,383	$18,300,000	$19,000,000
Alabama	324,809	324,811	328,879
Alaska	43,332	45,872	47,999
Arizona	234,669	242,666	253,918
Arkansas	182,895	184,902	193,475
California	1,843,023	1,885,497	1,973,864
Colorado	238,045	242,383	253,622
Connecticut	216,562	218,562	221,623
Delaware	45,110	45,110	45,628
District of Columbia	37,986	37,943	39,702
Florida	690,782	710,509	743,977
Georgia	456,707	462,113	483,540
Hawaii	77,911	81,266	85,034
Idaho	86,478	91,177	95,404
Illinois	880,595	880,595	915,527
Indiana	433,107	433,107	447,690
Iowa	223,770	223,770	231,993
Kansas	182,051	184,619	193,179
Kentucky	292,351	292,351	305,472
Louisiana	381,267	383,962	401,765
Maine	86,621	86,929	90,960
Maryland	312,020	312,020	321,471
Massachusetts	397,014	397,014	404,136
Michigan	723,648	723,648	736,273
Minnesota	319,417	319,417	332,730
Mississippi	224,821	225,259	236,141
Missouri	369,947	372,069	389,321
Montana	65,842	66,825	69,924
Nebraska	124,369	125,439	131,255
Nevada	64,717	66,259	69,331
New Hampshire	70,626	71,356	74,664

State	1985 Actual	1986 Estimate	1987 Estimate
New Jersey	533,102	533,102	549,316
New Mexico	121,274	123,457	129,181
New York	1,266,801	1,266,801	1,300,404
North Carolina	450,485	453,336	474,356
North Dakota	55,150	56,065	58,665
Ohio	835,531	835,531	853,010
Oklahoma	258,305	259,888	272,880
Oregon	199,215	200,759	210,068
Pennsylvania	839,143	839,143	862,195
Rhode Island	64,967	64,967	66,961
South Carolina	260,837	262,487	274,658
South Dakota	57,401	58,330	61,035
Tennessee	353,704	353,704	368,877
Texas	1,305,992	1,334,472	1,397,290
Utah	171,359	176,974	185,179
Vermont	39,393	39,642	41,480
Virginia	404,231	404,349	423,098
Washington	322,740	328,180	343,397
West Virginia	151,944	151,944	157,328
Wisconsin	368,142	368,142	378,655
Wyoming	45,020	45,305	47,406
Puerto Rico	350,093	353,664	370,063
Virgin Islands	12,631	13,025	13,629
American Samoa	4,502	4,814	5,037
Guam	12,632	13,875	14,518
Trust Territories 1/	18,046	18,046	20,148
Northern Mariana Islands	2,251	2,548	2,667

1/ In FY 1986 and FY 1987, some of these funds will be provided by the Department of Interior, in conjunction with the enactment of the Compact of Free Association.

Child Abuse and Neglect State Grants
State Allocations

State	1985 Actual	1986 Estimate 1/	1987 Estimate
Total	$12,000,000	$11,441,000	$-0-
Alabama	234,522	198,705	
Alaska	75,515	71,703	
Arizona	188,188	164,811	
Arkansas	157,874	137,481	
California	1,131,116	942,496	
Colorado	190,183	164,677	
Connecticut	175,772	150,208	
Delaware	75,684	70,631	
Dist. of Columbia	61,237	67,952	
Florida	457,647	386,395	
Georgia	319,946	268,637	
Hawaii	97,058	88,449	
Idaho	102,689	93,138	
Illinois	566,018	463,963	
Indiana	0	252,426	
Iowa	180,410	154,897	
Kansas	157,207	137,347	
Kentucky	222,164	188,122	
Louisiana	275,541	231,661	
Maine	100,873	91,128	
Maryland	230,957	195,356	
Massachusetts	279,186	232,733	
Michigan	468,096	382,912	
Minnesota	237,914	200,447	
Mississippi	167,566	156,773	
Missouri	209,278	226,035	
Montana	88,775	81,617	
Nebraska	123,083	109,348	
Nevada	74,580	81,349	
New Hampshire	91,598	83,760	

	1985 Actual	1986 Estimate	1987 Estimate
New Jersey	360,879	298,378	
New Mexico	121,423	108,410	
New York	585,735	637,988	
North Carolina	316,131	264,484	
North Dakota	82,478	76,526	
No. Marianas Is.	51,133	51,206	
Ohio	280,020	435,695	
Oklahoma	202,124	173,385	
Oregon	167,490	144,984	
Pennsylvania	0	439,848	
Rhode Island	87,783	80,277	
South Carolina	203,614	174,189	
South Dakota	83,641	77,598	
Tennessee	257,968	216,791	
Texas	820,058	681,796	
Utah	150,754	133,730	
Vermont	73,203	68,756	
Virginia	284,945	241,307	
Washington	187,537	205,270	
West Virginia	138,479	121,137	
Wisconsin	264,435	221,212	
Wyoming	76,508	71,435	
American Samoa	52,581	52,277	
Guam	56,236	56,564	
Puerto Rico	238,370	217,327	
Trust Territory 2/	58,868	59,110	
Virgin Islands	56,921	56,163	

1/ Distribution of funds estimated on assumption that all States and Territories will participate.

2/ If eligible, in FY 1986 and FY 1987, some of these funds will be provided by the Department of the Interior, in conjunction with the enactment of the Compact of Free Association.

A-11

Department of Education

CHAPTER 1 ALLOCATIONS FOR THE 1986-87 SCHOOL YEAR

	Local Education Agency Basic Grants	Handicapped Children in State Schools	Neglected or Delinquent Children	Migratory Children	State Administration	Total
Alabama	$82,711,765	$385,649	$311,747	$1,841,628	$802,699	$86,853,488
Alaska	5,003,169	1,946,610	188,056	3,531,362	225,000	10,894,197
Arizona	31,532,902	562,115	536,098	6,346,043	359,926	39,327,083
Arkansas	36,251,241	1,504,557	257,457	4,144,301	389,356	42,546,912
California	287,872,728	1,422,520	2,740,150	74,927,496	3,389,511	370,352,405
Colorado	28,885,269	2,561,171	322,503	2,374,168	315,368	34,458,479
Connecticut	33,436,091	2,206,957	1,215,846	2,773,164	366,084	39,999,943
Delaware	8,855,172	2,489,011	168,746	804,149	225,000	12,542,079
Florida	126,822,803	4,742,007	1,472,323	20,975,977	1,422,567	156,435,677
Georgia	81,560,155	1,636,167	802,595	2,096,913	795,238	86,891,068
Hawaii	9,889,693	308,952	57,239	—	225,000	10,480,884
Idaho	8,979,272	153,910	56,529	3,434,098	225,000	12,848,808
Illinois	144,472,064	21,252,666	942,387	2,282,880	1,560,349	170,490,346
Indiana	46,226,477	3,869,320	735,493	773,997	476,660	52,081,947
Iowa	27,291,366	307,567	364,590	134,099	259,528	28,357,150
Kansas	21,365,592	1,072,757	504,789	2,777,606	237,574	25,958,318
Kentucky	54,395,293	1,385,189	383,798	2,304,716	539,873	58,968,869
Louisiana	74,539,651	2,135,654	637,655	4,936,710	759,712	83,009,382
Maine	13,024,292	610,425	172,579	2,495,593	225,000	16,527,889
Maryland	52,840,880	1,242,866	1,239,153	335,445	514,097	56,172,441
Massachusetts	67,784,458	9,316,762	399,118	4,876,782	760,890	83,138,008
Michigan	122,967,614	7,371,539	1,404,085	7,331,268	1,284,584	140,359,091
Minnesota	37,660,227	248,889	383,993	1,196,411	384,585	39,836,105
Mississippi	57,444,025	505,017	312,307	2,048,409	557,061	60,866,819
Missouri	49,723,079	1,237,482	286,131	1,108,781	483,590	52,839,062
Montana	10,070,548	370,849	143,776	242,532	225,000	11,052,705
Nebraska	15,947,178	151,284	108,472	363,739	225,000	16,793,673
Nevada	5,442,379	285,899	156,926	521,256	225,000	6,631,460
New Hampshire	7,160,948	609,322	80,319	82,959	225,000	8,158,546
New Jersey	101,620,923	3,486,584	1,284,488	2,023,391	1,001,596	109,416,782
New Mexico	24,343,702	206,563	299,621	1,676,748	245,017	26,771,651
New York	321,508,721	26,498,954	3,426,141	4,400,606	3,286,721	359,121,145
North Carolina	72,395,310	1,511,553	973,300	3,245,697	721,622	78,847,482
North Dakota	7,070,759	313,595	82,323	564,256	225,000	8,235,933
Ohio	109,115,806	4,398,966	1,488,281	1,297,904	1,074,232	117,375,188
Oklahoma	34,643,362	722,709	168,897	1,509,814	342,170	37,386,952
Oregon	26,948,484	3,355,128	689,303	6,522,215	346,514	37,861,643
Pennsylvania	148,840,820	12,516,929	1,034,668	1,824,999	1,516,820	165,734,237
Rhode Island	11,748,764	408,605	18,470	111,049	225,000	12,509,887
South Carolina	47,251,862	480,531	672,747	271,624	449,611	49,126,374
South Dakota	9,203,664	250,333	76,155	39,545	225,000	9,794,696
Tennessee	84,073,643	583,606	810,431	250,690	606,833	86,305,205
Texas	201,048,005	5,434,184	1,196,428	51,243,828	2,391,578	261,314,004
Utah	10,573,402	789,683	162,870	528,951	225,000	12,279,886
Vermont	6,285,837	1,347,885	88,390	498,400	225,000	8,445,512
Virginia	58,765,170	907,230	610,299	335,090	559,906	61,177,697
Washington	40,242,242	2,254,014	75,360	10,217,302	487,593	53,276,511
West Virginia	28,016,044	800,488	193,051	50,653	268,420	29,328,657
Wisconsin	46,812,990	1,500,411	705,857	987,613	481,896	50,468,768
Wyoming	3,830,441	873,614	149,437	290,259	225,000	5,368,751
District of Columbia	13,824,307	2,855,601	481,893	50,546	225,000	17,237,348
Puerto Rico	109,261,432	277,621	202,930	1,382,465	1,026,419	112,150,866
American Samoa	1,648,588	18,903	—	—	50,000	1,717,491
Guam	1,741,744	184,888	—	—	50,000	1,976,632
Trust territory	5,105,168	—	—	—	50,000	5,155,168
Northern Mariana	696,740	—	—	18,869	50,000	765,609
Virgin Islands	3,401,523	69,349	—	—	50,000	3,520,872
Bureau of Indian Affairs	22,226,218	—	—	—	—	22,226,218
Evaluation and studies	—	—	—	—	—	5,020,000
Migrant coordination activities	—	—	—	6,762,000	—	6,762,000
Total	$3,082,400,000	$143,713,000	$31,214,000	$253,149,000	$34,076,000	$3,529,572,000

YOUTH AND AMERICA'S FUTURE:
THE WILLIAM T. GRANT FOUNDATION COMMISSION ON WORK, FAMILY AND CITIZENSHIP

American Youth: A Statistical Snapshot (July 1987)
James Wetzel

Drawing on the latest, statistically reliable government surveys, this demographic review captures much of the diversity inherent in a collective portrait of American 16–24 year-olds. Includes data on marriage, childbearing, living arrangements, income, education, employment, health and juvenile justice. Historical trends as well as future projections are presented along with *12 charts, 18 tables*.

Current Federal Policies and Programs for Youth (June 1987)
J.R. Reingold and Associates

Who is doing what for youth in the federal government? This concise survey of current federal policies and programs for youth in Education, Health and Human Services, Labor, Justice and Defense provides a one-of-a-kind resource for researchers, practitioners, analysts and policymakers who want quick access to accurate information about federal youth policy. *Includes state-level allocation tables.*

Youth Policies and Practices in Selected Countries (August 1987)
Rosemary George

Presents the salient features of the post-compulsory education and training policies of 11 foreign countries designed to smooth the transition of non-college bound youth into the workplace. The countries are: Australia, Britain, Canada, Finland, France, West Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Norway and Sweden. *Includes tables.*

* * *

Publications of the Commission are not copyrighted and their reproduction and distribution is encouraged. When quoting or reproducing Commission publications, please note the source as "**Youth and America's Future:** The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship."

Single copies of these publications are currently available without charge by writing to:

William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Youth and America's Future
Suite 301, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036-5541